

BX

1779

.L6

Leslie



The University of Chicago
Libraries



GIFT

THE CASE STATED

BETWEEN

THE CHURCH OF ROME

AND

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

WHEREIN IS SHOWN THAT THE

DOUBT AND DANGER IS IN THE FORMER,

AND THE

CERTAINTY AND SAFETY IN THE LATTER COMMUNION.

BY THE

REV. CHARLES LESLIE, A.M.

11

"For their Rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being Judges."
DEUT. xxxii. 31.

DUBLIN:

THOMAS CONNOLLY 6, CHANCERY PLACE.

1849.

BX 1779

.L6



"Gift"

1154936

chq.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. Jerusalem the Mother Church,	1
II. Of the supremacy of St. Peter,	2
III. Of the Unity of the Church,	6
IV. Of new Articles of Faith, and of the Sacraments,	11
V. More divisions in the Church of Rome than among us,	11
VI. The Communion of Rome the least part of the Catholic Church,	12
VII. Of General Councils. And how the Church of Rome came to be called, first the Latin, and then the Catholic Church,	13
VIII. The Infallibility of General Councils,	14
IX. Of the promises of Infallibility, &c. made to the Church,	16
X. Of the Infallibility of the Apostles,	20
XI. Of Miracles and the Legends,	21
XII. The Circle of Church, and Scriptures; of God's being obliged to give us an infallible guide,	22
XIII. None saved but by Christ, yet this condemns not the Heathen; Our advantage over them; Of the Jews and Samaritans; The Jews had a stronger plea than the Church of Rome; the great defection foretold; the chief of the Jews rejected their Messiah; Christ was not the Church,	24
XIV. Of Private Judgment, and the Mysteries of Faith,	29
XV. Of the Deists,	30
XVI. Of Authority and Evidence; of false Gospels, &c. of various Lections and Translations; of the French Translations,	31
XVII. No security to the People in the infallibility of the Church,	37
XVIII. Of a living infallible Judge. And the Church being reduced to one Laic, a Woman, or an Infant,	37
XIX. Of the Deposing Power,	41
XX. Particularly in France; Oath of the Bishops to the Pope; the Bull in Cœnæ; the Coronation of the Pope; Canonization of Pius V.	43
XXI. The Confederacy to stop the Reformation in France; Of the Church and Court of Rome; of the Pope's Supremacy,	49
XXII. Of Excommunication; who is Judge? makes the Pope absolute; most of the Roman Catholics, and all their Kings excommunicated by the Pope,	52
XXIII. No outward Infallible Judge; Why Christ not known to the Church; why so few believed on	

	PAGE
him at first; an infallible Guide no security, unless we were infallible too; how the Angels, and Adam, and the Seven Churches fell; the Infallibility; the likeliest means to bring on the general defection; the Infallibility not to be found; four different schemes of it,	54
XXIV. The state of the Creation; reason our guide, with all its failings,	59
XXV. Rome the damning Church, yet the learned among them allow the Salvability of Protestants; the Testimony of Queen Mary of Scotland; and of James V.	61
XXVI. The Roman Catholics of England kept Communion with us after the Reformation; the Pope made the breach of Communion,	63
XXVII. Of the words Papist and Roman Catholic; let her tell which was the Catholic Church, before Rome was Christian; no Church was ever Catholic in the sense of the Church of Rome,	64
XXVIII. How the Church of Rome came by her greatness; the Government of the Church from the beginning; the desperateness of some who would be reconciled to Rome,	65
XXIX. France still in the dregs of Popery as to Doctrine and Worship,	67
XXX. Of Confession, Opus Operatum, and means of Grace; the many Consecrations of Means of Grace in the Church of Rome; our Rites and Ceremonies, &c. no means of Grace,	67
XXXI. Invocation of Saints, &c.	70
XXXII. The Heathen worshipped the true God, with inferior Gods, as Ministers of his Kingdom; Suppositions; Demons and Saints,	72
XXXIII. The Worship of the Virgin Mary; and of the Index Expurgatorius	79
XXXIV. Of Reliques,	81
XXXV. Images of the Saints; the honour we pay to the Saints,	82
XXXVI. Images of God,	84
XXXVII. Transubstantiation; wherein of Implicit Faith,	87
XXXVIII. The Cross worshipped with Latria; and the Images of Christ,	98
XXXIX. The Præputium of Christ; and parcels of his blood,	99
XL. Taking the Cup from the Laity; and Marriage from the Clergy,	102
XLI. Purgatory; wherein of Tradition, Supererogation; of Prayers for the Dead, and in an Unknown Tongue; Conclusion; Of the Church and her Unity, &c.	109
Appendix,	130

A CONVERSATION

BETWEEN

AN ENGLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC NOBLEMAN AND A GENTLEMAN, HIS FRIEND, OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

LORD—It is hard that by your late Act of Parliament I must either lose my estate or change my religion.

Gentleman—I think your lordship ought not to lose your estate, till you have first considered how far your conscience will allow you to conform to what is required of you.

Lord—If I thought I could save my soul in the Church of England, I would think myself obliged to preserve my right and posterity.

Gentleman—Pray, my lord, what is there in the communion of the Church of England should make you think your soul in any danger? Would there be any hazard of your soul if there were no invocation of saints that are dead, in the public offices of the Church; no pictures or images of God to be seen there; no elevation of the host, which was but of late years brought into the Church; no prayers for souls out of purgatory; if the public prayers were in the vulgar tongue; and if the sacrament were given in both kinds? For these are all the differences you will find betwixt your public offices and ours.

Lord—But I must keep in the communion of the Church, else I think I cannot save my soul.

Gentleman—Your lordship means in the communion of the Church of Rome.

1. **Lord**—Yes, for she is the Mother Church, and centre of unity to all other churches, insomuch that who are not of her communion, are out of the pale of the Catholic Church.

Gentleman—My lord, it is certain that Jerusalem was

the Mother Church, where Christ first planted the Gospel, and commanded that it should be thence propagated to all other nations, as he himself said, "*beginning* at Jerusalem."* And till after the vision of the sheet to St. Peter, (Acts x.) no Gentile was admitted; as it is said, "They travelled—preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only."† So that the Jewish Christian Church was the only Church for some time, and she it was who converted the Gentile nations, and, therefore, was the Mother Church to them all.

And Rome was not the first Gentile Church, for "the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch."‡ And the Greek Church was before the Latin. The New Testament was written in Greek for their use, therefore the Greek Church could not be the daughter of the Latin Church, which was born after her.

2. *Lord*—But St. Peter having been Bishop of Rome, and Christ having constituted him to be the head of the Catholic Church throughout the whole world, the same must descend to his successors, the Bishops of Rome.

Gentleman—This will not make her the Mother Church. You may call her supreme, absolute, universal, or what you please, anything but the Mother Church, to which it is impossible she should have any title.

In the conversion of the Gentiles to Christianity, one man and one nation must receive the faith before another, they were not all converted on a day. And as when one man converts another, so it is of churches and nations, it gives the one no superiority over the other, except that of gratitude and esteem, but nothing of authority.

But whatever the privilege of the Mother Church may be, if it can be translated from the mother to the daughter, from one church to another, from Jerusalem to Antioch, and thence to Rome, as you must be obliged to say; then it may be translated from Rome also to some other church, unless some positive command of Christ can be produced, first to fix it at Rome, and then a promise that it shall never thence be removed. But the Church of Rome is not once named in all the New Testament, unless she is meant by the "Church at Babylon."§ Nor is there any promise whatsoever made to her, or any the

* Luke xxiv. 47. † Acts xi. 19. ‡ Acts xi. 26. § 1 Pet. v. 13.

least intimation of her being the head of the Churches, the standard and centre of unity to them all. Strange! if that be the *Summa rei Christianæ*, as Bellarmin calls it (in the preface to his book *de Romano Pontifice*) the "Sum and foundation of the Christian religion."

And, as silent are the Scriptures concerning the supposed universal supremacy of St. Peter, or that he ever was at Rome, or bishop of Rome. Some after-writers have mentioned it; but that it is far from such an universal tradition as is sufficient for the mighty superstructure which is raised upon it. But, let it be granted, it signifies nothing, because all is founded upon some words said to St. Peter, such as, "Thou art Peter; feed my sheep," &c. which cannot be strained to such an universal supremacy as the popes have claimed, nor were so understood in the primitive church; for which I refer your lordship to a book I know you value, and favoured me with the perusal of it, the learned Monsieur du Pin's *Traité de la Puissance Ecclesiastique et Temporelle*. Printed at Paris, 1707, where, p. 495 to p. 501 and p. 754 to p. 765, you will find all these texts urged for the supremacy of St. Peter, answered in the same manner as is done by the Protestant writers, and it is shewed how very foreign they are from the purpose intended.

And that the "rock" upon which Christ said he would build* his church, was not Peter, but the faith which Peter then confessed, your lordship may see the current sense of the Fathers, and consult at your leisure St. Augustine, de Verb. Dom. Ser. 13. Nazianzen de Vet. Testam. St. Cyril, de Trin. lib. 4. St. Chrysostom, Hom. 55, in Matth. St. Ambrose, com. in Ephes. 2. Hilary, de Trin. lib. 2, cap. 6. And there are many others.

But nothing that was said of St. Peter is so express for an universal supremacy as what St. Paul said of himself, that "the care of all the churches"† lay upon him. And again, "so ordain I in all churches."‡ If such a decretal could be produced of St. Peter's, I doubt not that it would have been made use of towards proving his universal supremacy. In the Acts of the apostles it is told that St. Paul was at Rome preaching the gospel two whole years together, Acts xxviii. 30, 31. But not a word of St. Peter's being there. And as St. Paul planted the Gospel

* Mat. xvi. 18.

† 2 Cor. xi. 28.

‡ 1 Cor. vii. 17.

at Rome, so he wrote to the church there, as his particular charge; for he says, "I speak to you, Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office."* But St. Peter was the apostle of the Jews, they were his particular charge; and he himself allowed, "That the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to Paul, as the Gospel of the circumcision was to himself."† And, accordingly he directed his epistle to the Jews of the dispersion, who were strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. But he wrote not to the Gentiles, particularly not to Rome, which would seem strange, if he had been Bishop of Rome, and that had been his chief and principal charge. And St. Paul's "withstanding him to the face" before the whole church of Antioch, in behalf of the Gentiles whom he had misled, "fearing them who were of the circumcision," shews the care St. Paul took of those who were more particularly his charge; and seems a behaviour not very suitable to the supreme head of the church both Jews and Gentiles, if St. Paul had known anything of St. Peter's being so constituted by Christ.

And as little had it become the other apostles to send their sovereign upon business, as they sent Peter to Samaria.‡

But if, as some say, St. Peter was bishop of the Jewish converts at Rome, and St. Paul of the Gentiles there, St. Paul would have had a much greater flock than St. Peter, and the successors of St. Paul, and not of St. Peter, must have been bishops there, because the Church of Rome is now, and has long been, all of the Gentiles.

But the surest way to find out the truth is by fact, and not straining expressions, which may have several meanings. The eastern monarchs have used to give themselves mighty titles, as son of the sun, and brother of the stars, and king of all the kings of the earth, &c. but will any believe that any of them was the universal monarch for all this, contrary to plain fact?

Pray, my Lord, let me ask you, do you think one could write the history of a king—suppose of King Charles the II, and in all the history neither call him king, mention his restoration, coronation, or tell of one regal act he ever did, as calling a parliament, or presiding in it, sending or receiving an ambassador, or granting a commission,

* Rom. xi. 13.

† Gal. ii. 7, 8, 9.

‡ Acts viii. 14.

&c.? And so of a pope, could his history be written without calling him pope, or telling of one papal act of his?

Lord—No; it is impossible, for such an history could not be called the history of a king, or of a pope.

Gentleman—Now, my lord, let me apply this. We have the history of the Acts of the Apostles, in which St. Peter has a great share, though not so much as St. Paul, and there is a council mentioned wherein both of them were present, and there is not a title of any superiority of St. Peter over St. Paul, or any other of the apostles, either in that council or any where else throughout that whole history, which, as your lordship has determined, is impossible if St. Peter had that supremacy which the Popes have claimed as his successors.

This is so demonstrative a proof, that the writers on your side think it necessary for them to endeavour some solution to it. But the weakness of their answer is a yet greater confirmation on our side. For they can find no other way to get some superiority to St. Peter in this council, than to suppose that he opened it, because, as they say, he spoke first, which would not infer the supremacy they intend, if it were true; but it is plainly otherwise, for it is said, “And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up and said”^{*}—nor did he speak last, for after he had done, Paul and Barnabas declared the conversion of the Gentiles by their means, without putting them under the Law, which was the point in debate; and after they had held their peace, St. James, who was bishop of Jerusalem, where the council was held, did, as president, resume what had been said by St. Peter and others, and gave his definitive sentence upon the whole, “Wherefore my sentence is”—and the decree of the council was drawn up in the words of St. James. So that it is plain he closed the council, whoever opened it or spoke first, which is not so material as to be told in this account of that council: but dismissing the council, and putting an end to it, seems of greater authority. If what is said of St. James here had been said of St. Peter, I question not it would have been made use of as a full proof of his supremacy, and presiding in that council.

Lord—I must confess the history of the New Testament

^{*} Acts xv. 7.

is very barren, as to facts relating to the authority of St. Peter over the other apostles. We must depend upon the texts beforementioned of "Feed my sheep," &c.

Gentleman—None of these texts are so express as what I quoted of St. Paul. But if they were meant in that extent for which you produced them, it is impossible but that must appear in the facts of St., Peter, especially in the part he bore in that council at Jerusalem. And facts are the surest explanation of words.

We discourse now only of authority, what authority one apostle had over another, for that is the point wherein we are concerned. We speak not of their gifts and graces, and their labours in propagating the Gospel, wherein one might be more eminent and successful than another, but this gave him no authority over the others. And in this also St. Paul had the preference, for "he laboured more abundantly than they all.*" And all the epistles almost are his, to the several churches. And his miracles and conversations of infidels take up a much greater part in the Acts of the Apostles than those of St. Peter.

I have said so much of this matter, because the supposed supremacy of St. Peter, his being at Rome, and Bishop of Rome, is the whole foundation of that supremacy claimed by the Bishop or Church of Rome.

And if that be so essential a point, and upon which the unity of the church depends, insomuch that without it there is no church at all, according to the scheme drawn by modern Rome, it is inconceivable the Scriptures should be so wholly silent in it; nay, showing the very contrary in fact, as I have said already concerning St. Peter. And when the direct question was put to our blessed Saviour, upon the contest among the apostles which of them should be the greatest, Luke xxii. 24. I say, if this was so material a point as to the very being of the church, it is inconceivable he should not have determined it, but by his answer rather checked the error of their thought, and left them all upon a level.

3. *Lord*—I would gladly know your notion of the unity of the church, if all bishops, as you say of the apostles, were upon a level, without any head bishop, or principle of unity among them; for we are told that Christ has but one church upon earth.

* 1 Cor. xv. 10.

Gentleman—Your lordship may add, and in heaven too ; for all are one church to Christ, of which he alone is the head. And one part being militant, the other triumphant, makes them not two churches, but two states of the same church ; which is called “one family in heaven and earth.”* In like manner, heaven, earth, and hell, are one kingdom to the great Creator, for “his kingdom ruleth over all.” And of the earth it is said, “The kingdom is the Lord’s and he is the governor among the nations.”† All the nations are one kingdom to him : but he has appointed no universal monarch as his deputy of his kingdom of the earth, but each nation is governed by their respective rulers, independent of each other. For so his wisdom has disposed, according to the capacity of his creatures, for what man would be sufficient to govern the whole world ? And where must the seat be of this universal monarch ? Must he not have as many or more deputies under him, as there are now kings or nations ? And what prudence could prevent defections and rebellions in far distant provinces. This has overthrown great monarchies, which have fallen with their own weight. What then could support an universal monarchy ? When nations go to war, other neighbour kings and states may interpose, assist the oppressed, be mediators and guarantees of peace. But this could not be in case of defection from the universal monarch, for who assist rebels are rebels themselves. And such wars could not but end in the utter destruction of the one side or the other. Therefore God has consulted best for the peace and safety of mankind, in distributing the world into several independent governments, rather than to put all under the dominion of one.

Lord—But when nations are at war, where is the unity of this one kingdom of God upon earth ?

Gentleman—It is disturbed where those wars are, but it is not yet totally dissolved ; for there are laws of war wherein all agree. There is still what we call the law of nations, which as it maintains commerce in peace, so it regulates the fury of war. And there is one unity which nothing can dissolve, that is, “God having made of one blood all nations upon the earth.” So that here is an unity of relation, of humanity, and of common principles which all retain ?

* Eph. iii. 14.

† Psalm xxii. 28.

Lord—But how is this unity kept?

Gentleman—Not as it should be:—but so as is consistent with our fallen state, and the corruptions of mankind. It is not such an unity as is in God's kingdom of heaven; which yet was once disturbed by rebellion.

Lord—But there ought to be a stricter unity in the church than in the temporal world.

Gentleman—I wish it were so, but, alas, it is not. And the frailty of man shows itself in the church as well as in the state. The many heresies and divisions in the church have rent her to pieces, and broken her unity, as much as wars have that of the temporal world.

Lord—That is for not adhering to the head and universal monarch of the church.

Gentleman—No, my lord, it is that pretence in the Church of Rome has been the great cause of these divisions. It has procured peace in the church, just as setting up an universal monarchy would in the world, that is, fill it with more confusion and bloodshed than ever was in it, or could otherwise possibly be. For which reason God has appointed no universal monarch in the church more than in the state. For as Gregory the Great said to John, bishop of Constantinople, (who, upon the seat of the empire being translated thither, set up for an universal supremacy in the church,) "If the church should come to depend upon one, it must suddenly fall." And St. Cyprian said, "That therefore Christ made the college of bishops numerous, that if one should fall or turn heretical, the rest might interpose for the saving of the flock." For he says, "There is but one flock, and one episcopate, of which every bishop has the whole in partnership with the rest." *Episcopatus unus est, cujus à singulis in solidum pars tenetur.* This was the frame of the church in his days, and before from the apostles; this was the very state of the apostles themselves, who thus shared of the apostolate, the whole of which was given to each in partnership, or in common with the rest.

Lord—This then is your notion of the church, that as all nations upon earth are one kingdom to God, so all Christian churches are one church to Christ, without any universal monarch in either case. And that as the unity of the world consists in what we call the law of nations, which is common to all, so the unity of the church consists in the common Christianity wherein all agree.

If so, then every one who believeth in Christ is a Christian.

Gentleman—Yes, surely, as every one that believeth in Mahomet is a Mahometan.

Lord—Then there is no need to be of any church, if you believe in Christ that is enough.

Gentleman—No, we must obey his commandments too, which oblige us to live peaceably and quietly as members of that body or church whereto we appertain, with Christian love and fellowship with all others, and not to make schisms and divisions by breaking communion, where nothing sinful is required as a condition of it. And when such disorderly persons are cast out of the church, or cut themselves off by a causeless separation, though they are no longer of the church, yet they cease not to be Christians; (that is a nostrum of the Church of Rome,) and they must answer for their schism, as for other sins, all of which are damnable in their own nature, without repentance. And yet allowances are made for invincible ignorance occasioned by the prejudices of education, &c. but not for obstinacy. No society of men will bear such perverse members among them.

Now a church is a society professing such a religion, be it true or false. Thus there is a church of the Jews, of Heathens, of Christians, and Mahometans. And I would ask your lordship which is any of these churches? For instance, which is the church of the Mahometans?

Lord—It is the Turks, Moors, Persians, the great Mogul, &c.

Gentleman—Yet there is no chief priest over all these, but every church as well as nation is independent of each other; and thus it is among the several nations and churches of the heathens. The Jews were but one nation, and a small one, therefore they had as one king, so one high-priest. There was something like this, in that part of the Christian Church which was within the Roman empire. But to extend the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome beyond the limits of the Emperor of Rome, even to all the Christian Churches in the world, is a fancy never came into the heads of any other mortals, and is not necessary to denominate many churches professing the same religion to be one church, as of the Heathens and Mahometans, all of which are called the Heathen, or the Mahometan Church or churches; without any common

head over them all. And there is not one word in Scripture appointing such an universal head in the Christian Church, or altering this common sentiment of mankind, as to the meaning of the word church; or taking it in any other sense than commonly understood by all the world. And thus in our way of speaking, when we say the fathers of the church, or the primitive church, we mean not any particular church, but the whole body or Church of Christians, though divided into many nations or churches.

Lord—But all in subordination to the Church of Rome.

Gentleman—What, before there was a Church of Rome? For there were Christian Churches before, as I have told you. And after there was a church at Rome, the bishops and fathers of those times knew nothing of its supremacy, far less of its infallibility, nor ever appealed to it in their disputes with heretics; which had been the shortest and the surest way, and impossible to have been forgot, had it been known, and received as the current faith, or but opinion of the church. But, on the contrary, other churches have contended with that of Rome, and asserted their own liberties and independency upon her, when her encroachments began to arise and disturb the peace and unity of the church, which I shall shew you presently. But this is only to let you see, that the unity of the church was then understood, not as being united under any one supreme bishop or church; but in the concord and good agreement of the several churches among themselves, and in the unity of the common faith. Which unity is described by their all having “one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one spirit,”* from which they are called “one body.” The “unity of the spirit” is their unity with God, and the “bond of peace” is the unity of the churches with each other, as members of the same body. And this is a much stricter and closer union than that of the secular world. All churches agree in that summary of our faith called the Apostles’ Creed. And the Church of Rome herself must think this sufficient for salvation, because she requires no other profession of faith in baptism, or for being admitted into the church. But the twelve new articles of faith which the council of Trent has added to the twelve of the apostles, which we call Pope Pius’s Creed, and is required to be professed by converts, has

* Ephes. iv. 3–5.

made many contests and divisions in the church; and I have not yet met with any Roman Catholic so hardy as to say, that the belief of all these is necessary to salvation, only that we should not deny or oppose them, such as purgatory, the invocation of saints, &c.

4. *Lord*—The church pretends not to make new articles of faith, but only to explain the old ones. And such are what you call the new articles of Trent.

Gentleman—What article in the Apostles' Creed does transubstantiation explain? For there is nothing at all of the sacraments in that creed.

Lord—Are not the sacraments then part of our faith?

Gentleman—They are the signs and seals of our faith, as circumcision was called, Rom. iv. 11, but not the faith itself, and therefore are not put into that summary of our faith.

Lord—But are they not necessary to salvation?

Gentleman—They are “generally necessary,” as our catechism words it, that is, to be reverently used when they may be had. But they are not absolutely necessary, so that if our circumstances, or places where we live are such as not to afford us the opportunity of receiving the sacraments, we should be damned for want of them. I think none will say this. They are means of God's appointment, therefore to be used, when we can have them; we are tied to this, but God is not tied to those means to which he ties us; he can save without them.

Lord—But we have seven sacraments, and you have but two.

Gentleman—That is, we take the word sacrament in a stricter sense than you do; and of the five which you have more than we, you cannot say that they are so much as generally necessary to salvation, because none can partake of them all, for your sacrament of orders excludes all the laity, and that of marriage the clergy.

5. *Lord*—It is a sad thing that the church should be divided about these matters. But we are all one, you are miserably divided. How many sects or churches are there among you?

Gentleman—Not so many as with you.

Lord—How can that be? We have but one church which we own as such.

Gentleman—If a church is answerable for all that break off from her, then you have all these sects to reckon for, and us too, which is one more.

Lord—A church is not answerable for those who break off from her, because they are no longer of her.

Gentleman—Then we are not answerable for those sects which break off from our church.

Lord—But we are all one among ourselves.

Gentleman—So is every church or sect; that is, those who agree among themselves, do agree. So that this is no more a mark of unity than every division of men can plead, and every sect.

6. *Lord*—But we are the great body of Christians from which all broke off.

Gentleman—No, my lord, not the half, or ever were. The Greek Church is an elder church than yours, so that you rather broke off from her, by setting up your universal supremacy, which she never owned, nor the many other numerous churches in Asia; nor the great and once famous churches in Africa; nor the empire of Russia of vast extent in Europe, once a part of the Greek Church. These never owned the supremacy of Rome, and by far out-number all that ever did own it, or were of her communion as such. And considering how many kingdoms and nations have broke off from her since the reformation, her communion is now reduced to a very small part of the Christian Church, in comparison of those who differ from her.

Lord—But those other churches do not all communicate with each other.

Gentleman—Nor Rome with any of them, so that she stands by herself as other churches do; and the most irreconcilable of any, because by her principles she cannot communicate with any who will not own her supremacy; which, as it never was done by the greatest part of the Catholic Church, so there is little appearance that ever it will be; for it is observable that no nation which broke off from Rome did ever return to her again. It is a hard matter for one that has escaped out of a snare to be inveigled thither again. So that it is very visible Rome has been upon the losing hand about this two hundred years past; and that not only as to those who have quite forsaken her, but as to the change of principles and lowering her supre-

macy and infallibility amongst those who still remain in her communion, which I shall shew your lordship presently, and that old and new popery are very different things, and that Rome itself has in some measure been reformed by our reformation.

I know nothing should hinder me from communicating with the Greek Church, if I were there, while nothing sinful were required of me as a condition of communion, nor new creeds to be imposed on me; and so of the Churches of St. Thomas, the Jacobites, and others in the east of Asia; of whom we have very imperfect and uncertain accounts: and so of the Abyssinian, the Coptic, and other churches in Africa; the great Church of Russia in Europe, &c. But Rome, while she pretends to universal supremacy, can communicate with none but with herself; so that our communion is much more extended or extendable than that of Rome. And this universal supremacy is that which, most of any one thing in the world, hinders the union and communion of Christian Churches.

7. *Lord*—But though one church may be supreme, yet the best part of the Roman Catholics place not the infallibility there, but in a general or œcumenical council where all churches meet.

Gentleman—There never was such a council: the Roman empire had the vanity to call itself the *οικουμενη*, which we translate, “all the world,” Luke ii. 1. Hence the councils called within that empire styled themselves œcumenical, but no more truly so, than the Roman empire was all the world. But the Latin Church was not so much as the *οικουμενη* of the Empire for Greece and other parts of the Greek Church in Asia were in it, especially after the seat of the empire was translated to Constantinople; when they contended with Rome for the supremacy. And the Latin Church was not then called by the name of the Church of Rome, as the learned du Pin says in his *Traité de la Puissance Ecclesiastique*, &c. p. 551. “It is true (says he) that at present the name of the Church of Rome is given to the Catholic Church, and that these two terms pass for synonymous; but in antiquity no more was intended by the name of the Church of Rome, than the Church of the City of Rome, and the Popes in their subscriptions or superscriptions took simply the quality of Bishops of Rome. The Greek schismatics seem to be the first who gave the

name of the Church of Rome to all the churches of the West; whence the Latins made use of this to distinguish the churches which communicated with the Church of Rome; from the Greeks who were separated from her communion. From this came the custom to give the name of the Church of Rome to the Catholic Church; but the other churches did not for this lose their name, or their authority, &c." Then he goes on to vindicate the rights of every national church, independent of the Church of Rome, and past her power to control or alter. And the proceeding of the Parliament of Paris, printed in the Appendix, tells the Pope that his bishoprick extends only to the diocese of Rome, and his Patriarchate to those provinces called Suburbicarian; and that by taking upon him to excommunicate others unjustly, and where his power did not reach, he had excommunicated himself. And then he was so far from being head, that he was not so much as a member of the church. And they mind him, as likewise du Pin in the treatise before mentioned, p. 263, of the stout resistance made by the Bishops of France to the Pope who threatened to excommunicate all of them who would not submit to his decision; but they resolutely answered, that they would not submit to his will, and that if he came there to excommunicate them, he should go back excommunicated himself; *Si excommunicaturus veniret, excommunicatus abiret*. Now what is that head, which can be excommunicated by its members? What is that supremacy can be limited and controlled by its subjects, and of which they are the judges, and can say to it, as God to the sea, "hitherto shalt thou come and no farther, here shall thy proud waves be stayed?"

8. *Lord*—The church of France place the absolute supremacy and the infallibility not in the pope or church of Rome, but in a general council.

Gentleman—Which, as I told you, never was, and it is next to impossible ever should be.

And this gives up your whole foundation; for the popes, and not councils, pretend to be the successors of St. Peter and heirs of all the promises made to him.

In the next place you are not agreed among yourselves concerning general councils. Bellarmin (de Concil. l. 1. c. 6.) gives a list of general councils which are to be rejected, *Concilia generalia reprobata*, some for not being

approved by the Pope, some for heresy, and some, (he might have said all,) as not being received by the universal church, but he meant only the church of Rome. And chap. 7, is of general councils, partly confirmed, and partly reprobated. And chap. 8, is of a general council neither manifestly approved, nor manifestly rejected; this is going through all the degrees of uncertainty. And c. 5, (and *de Rom. Pont.* l. 4, c. 11,) he says, the several things in those councils allowed to be general, were foisted in by heretics, he knows not how; this was to get rid of some objections against these councils he could not answer otherwise. And (de *Eccles. Milit.* c. 16,) he quotes the last council of Lateran condemning the council of Basil, which he says, was at first a true œcumenical council, and infallible, but afterwards turned to a schismatical conventicle, and was of no authority at all. The Church of France receives the council of Basil and Constance wholly and throughout; but the Church of Rome reject both in part; so that they who place the infallibility in councils, will need another infallible judge to determine those disputes concerning the councils; which are truly general, and which not; and which are partly so, and which throughout; and what part of those that are throughout have been corrupted by heretics, if that can be called true throughout which is corrupted in any part. And when one council condemns another, which shall we believe? And if we must not believe every council that calls itself œcumenical, we can believe no other council against it, for the same reason; the second council of Ephesus is generally condemned in your church, yet it called itself œcumenical, and was as much so as any of the others; and what a thing is it to say, that a council is partly right and partly wrong? And who is judge of that? Is there any certainty in this? far less infallibility? And we must have an infallible method too to preserve the acts of these councils, that they be not adulterated, as Bellarmin says they have been; and they continue so to this day in the volumes of their councils. Why then are they not amended, and these suppositious and adulterated parts (these are Bellarmin's own words) struck out? But the several editions of their councils are in the hands of other churches, and therefore they can make no alteration in them without being detected.

So that the scheme of the infallibility you place in your

councils stands thus : the Church of Rome makes herself the universal or catholic church, insomuch that all who are not of her communion (which are by far the greatest part of the Christian churches in the world) are out of the pale of the catholic church ; and schismatics and heretics are no parts of a catholic council : thus a small part of the Latin church (exclusive of the Greek and all other churches) are the whole catholic church, and these little party councils, under the direction of the pope, are universal and infallible ! But, as is shewn, the Church of Rome has no right to the title of the Latin church itself, far less of the universal. And she has now but a small part of the Latin church left her ; the reformed, with Russia, and the Greek church, will out-number her in Europe, and she has no national church in her communion any where else.

Lord—But there are some of her communion in most countries.

Gentleman—Not so many as of the Jews, who by this are more universal than your church, and so more catholic. And none of the scattered seminaries of Rome in other Christian churches can be said to represent those churches in a general council, more than two or three titular popish bishops in England could represent the Church of England as it now stands. But, on the contrary, their living in a separate communion in other Christian churches, shows those churches not to be of their communion ; and therefore, cannot be represented in any of their councils ; and these calling themselves œcumenical, as the Roman empire did, shows only, how little criticisms upon words will avail against plain matter of fact ; which I have showed to be the case as to those texts urged for the supremacy of St. Peter ; and that if words would do it, there are more, nay and facts too, for the universal supremacy of St. Paul, at least over all the Christian churches of the Gentiles, which are now in all the world.

9. *Lord*—But there must be an infallibility somewhere in the church, and if it be neither in pope nor council, or that as you say, there never was, nor well can be a general council, truly so called, that is, of all the churches in the world, where do you place the infallibility ?

Gentleman—No where, my lord, nor can it be among men who are all fallible.

Lord—We trust not in men, as men, but assisted by the infallible Spirit of God. And this, he has promised, shall never depart from his church, as he has said, “My Spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed’s seed, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.”* And he has said, “That the priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts.”†

Gentleman—Read the next words, “But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord.” The first is what they should or ought to have done, the second is what they did do, which was quite contrary.

And, notwithstanding the promise made in the first text you quoted, yet “They were all gone out of the way, they were together become abominable, there was none that did good, no not one.—That all the world might become guilty before God,”‡ as well the church as the rest of the world. And of the church it is said, “The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint; from the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds and bruises and putrefying sores.”|| And God says, “Mine heritage is unto me as a lion in the forest, it crieth out against me, therefore have I hated it; mine heritage is unto me as a speckled bird,”§ &c.

And we have now long since seen that church of the Jews, to whom these promises were made, quite thrown off, and the church of the Gentiles come in its place.

Lord—These promises were ultimately intended to the Christian church.

Gentleman—But they were first given to the Jewish church, and belong even literally to her, and much more uncontestably than to the church of Rome, to whom no promise whatsoever was made. Nor has she any other pretence to the promises made to the church in general, than her supposed supremacy over all other Christian churches; which is disputed with her, and denied by the

* Isa. lix. 21.

† Mal. ii. 7.

‡ Rom. iii. 12, 19.

|| Isa. i. 5, 6.

§ Jer. xii. 8, 9.

other churches. But there was none to dispute it with the Jewish church, for she was then the only visible church of God upon earth. And if the promises made to her can fail, in vain does the Church of Rome, or even the whole Gentile church, claim these promises as indefeasible and unalterable to her. For if the promises made to the whole church of God upon earth can fail at one time, they may likewise at another; and there can be no certainty.

Lord—Can the promises of God then fail?

Gentleman—No, that is impossible, but we may mistake his promises, and not understand them aright; and we may not perform the conditions required.

Lord—But the promises made to the church (that particularly which I have named of Isai. lix. 21,) are positive and unconditional.

Gentleman—But there is still a condition implied, that is, of our obedience; which our Saviour has fully exemplified in the parable of the husbandmen who did not render the fruits of the vineyard. As treason forfeits an estate or honours given by a prince, though in never so positive terms, and without any condition expressed, but that of allegiance to the prince is always implied; and thus the church may forfeit her charter. God said to Eli, the high priest of the Jewish church, “I said indeed that thy house, and the house of thy father, should walk before me for ever; but now the Lord saith, be it far from me; for them that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed.”* And he said, “Ye shall know my breach of promise,”† or as our margin reads it, “the altering of my purpose.” And he has told us plainly that we are thus to understand his promises as well as threatenings, “At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation (or church) to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, (or church,) to build and to plant it, if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then will I repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them.”‡

This was the language of the prophets to the Jewish

* 1 Sam. ii. 30.

† Num. xiv. 34.

‡ Jer. xviii. 7, &c.

Church. But she understood it not, and leant upon the promises made to her as unconditional and indefeasible, let her be wicked as she would. And this hardened her against her prophets, whom she persecuted for this reason as enemies to the church, as you find, "Come, and let us devise devices against Jeremiah, for the law shall not perish from the priest."* Here the Jewish church stuck, and here the Church of Rome sticks at this day.

Lord—But the Gentile church cannot fail like the Jewish, for then there would be no church at all.

Gentleman—The apostle of the Gentiles says to the Gentile church, "Thou also shalt be cut off, if thou continue not in the goodness of God."† And that the Jews, "If they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graff them in again." This shews that all the promises made either to the Jewish or the Gentile church are conditional, viz. "If they continue in the goodness of God; otherwise," says St. Paul to the Gentile church, "thou also shalt be cut off." And of all the Gentile churches this was said more particularly to the Church of Rome, for this is in the epistle wrote to her, and to her it was said, "Thou also shalt be cut off."

And of the church in general, whether Jewish or Gentile, it is said, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith upon the earth?"‡ Where will then that visibility be, which Rome boasts of as an essential mark of the true church?

Lord—The church is compared to a city set upon a hill, to a candle giving light to all that are in the house. This is to shew her visibility.

Gentleman—She is likewise compared to a "Woman persecuted into a wilderness, to a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, to a besieged city."§ And lastly, that she will be so little visible, as that faith shall hardly be found upon the earth. This is not to be reconciled but of different states of the church, and at different times.

Lord—Christ says, that "his church is glorious, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish."§ And he calls her his beloved.

Gentleman—So God called the church of the Jews,

* Jer. xviii. 18. † Rom. xi. 22, 23. ‡ Luke xvii. 8.
 § Rev. xii. 6; Isa. i. 8. § Eph. v. 27.

"The dearly beloved of his soul;"* yet says, he had forsaken her for her wickedness, and hated her. And Isaiah represents her as most filthy and corrupted, chap. i. 4, 5, 6.

The church is called holy and beloved because of God's covenant with her to be his holy and beloved, which will be hereafter in those that are perfected; when the tares and the wheat shall be separated; but they must grow together till then, when "Christ shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity."† Then, and not till then, will the church be all "glorious without spot or wrinkle,"‡ &c. As the text says, "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it—that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle," &c. But he has not yet so presented it; that time is not come; she is still in her cleansing state, but not yet thoroughly cleansed. And the Scripture speaks of both these states of the church; but when we distinguish not, and would apply to the most corrupt state what is said of the most glorious, we must needs fall into many errors and mistakes.

This is the difficulty under which the Church of Rome now labours. She first making herself the Catholic Church, and then applying to herself, in this her corrupt state, whatever is said of the church, even in her perfect, glorious, and triumphant state, creates her infinite trouble, and endless distinctions, to reconcile these; which is as impossible to be done as to make the state of the church in heaven and upon the earth to be the same; and while the corruptions in the Church of Rome are confessed and lamented by the most learned and most pious in her own communion.

And she may as well maintain her impeccability as her infallibility; for sin is the greatest error. And therefore I think nothing can be infallible but what is likewise impeccable.

10. *Lord*—The apostles were infallible, but not impeccable.

Gentleman—As much the one as the other. St. Peter erred, and "Walked not uprightly according to the truth

* Jer. xii. 7.

† Matt. xiii. 41.

‡ Eph. v. 25.

of the Gospel.”* And “many were carried away with his dissimulation.” And St. Paul owned that in some cases he had no commandment of the Lord, only “gave his judgment,” as a private person, and “spoke by permission, and not of commandment.” But in other cases he says, “I command, yet not I but the Lord—and to the rest speak I, not the Lord.”† And it is so “after my judgment; and I think also that I have the spirit of God.” And no doubt great deference was paid to his judgment, as being an inspired person, but not infallible in every thing, as he himself said. The apostles were enabled to work many and great miracles, which gave them full credence as to what they delivered for Christian doctrine. But this was no personal nor universal infallibility.

11. *Lord*—The Church of Rome has her miracles too.

Gentleman—What! Both true and false? Can both come from God?

Lord—I know you deny our miracles.

Gentleman—And you cannot deny the many false miracles which have been notoriously detected in the Church of Rome. But if one sham miracle had been found in the apostles, I am afraid it had discredited all the others, and called their mission in question whether it was from God or not. The devil has power (when permitted) to “shew great signs and wonders,” as we are told, Matt. xxiv. 24. 2 Thess. ii. 9, and the reason is given v. 12, viz. as a just punishment to unrighteousness. But one false or pretended miracle is sufficient to disprove all that come from the same hand. Therefore your books of miracles, the legends, must either all be believed, or all rejected, all coming from the same authority; and the greatest part of them are so very gross and simple that no man of sense among you will say, that he can believe half of them. And your learned call them *piæ fraudes*, “holy cheats,” to stir up the devotion of the vulgar, who swallow all implicitly! And your lordship will have difficulty enough to believe all the miracles alleged of their relics. And, as I said, you must take all or none; unless you think that God can work true miracles, and the devil false ones, by the same means, and at the same time! Can you believe the quantities that have been shewn of the Virgin

* Gal. ii. 13, 14.

† 1 Cor. vii. 6, 10, 12, 25, 40.

Mary's milk at several times and places? And so of the wood of the cross that is showed in many places? Is it the same head or body of the same saint that is shewn at different churches, each of which contend that they have the true one? And each have miracles to vouch the truth of their relic! You may see a large collection of these, and the monstrousness of the legends out of which they are taken, in a book entitled, "The Devotions of the Roman Church;" which will prevent my giving instances in all the points before-mentioned.

Upon the whole, this pretence of miracles, the legends, and shops of relics, which are bought and sold, instead of a proof, are the greatest prejudice to men of sense, against your church.

And it is the sorest blow that Christianity has received, while the common people put these legends upon the level with the Holy Scriptures, as having both the same foundation, that is, the authority of your church. Whence Atheists and Deists take a handle to render both alike fabulous.

12. *Lord*—But after all, we believe the Scriptures upon the authority of the church.

Gentleman—This is the old circle out of which you can never conjure yourselves. You believe the Scriptures because the church bids you, and you believe the church because the Scriptures bid you. This is running round, and proving a thing by itself.

Lord—No; for we establish the authority of the church in the first place thus; we think it inconsistent with the goodness of God not to give men an infallible guide to lead them in the right way to heaven, since our own reason is so weak that we cannot trust to it; and that guide is the church.

Gentleman—How do you know that? What have you but your own reason to tell you so? And if you cannot trust your reason, you cannot believe the church. So that all bottoms upon your own reason still, from which you strive in vain to escape.

Lord—But the Scriptures bid us believe the church.

Gentleman—This is running into your circle again, to believe the church for the Scripture, and the Scriptures for the church. But I will bring you out of it. For pray tell me, why do you believe a God? It would be

blasphemy to say, you believe it upon any authority, for that would place such an authority above God. And it would be nonsense to say you believe it either from the church or the Scriptures, because you can believe neither without first believing there is a God. What is it then? We believe a God purely upon our own reason. And we cannot be more sure that there is a God, than we are persuaded of the truth of those reasons upon which we do believe it. And if God has given us no other guide but our own reason, with the assistance of his grace, to believe in himself; if this be all we have, or can have, for the first and main article of our creed, what farther do we require for those of less consequence? And that we cannot have more assurance than this, we may perceive by this experiment, viz. whether we believe most firmly and with greatest assurance, what we have only from our own reason, or what we receive upon the authority of the church. For example, are you not more undoubtedly assured of the being of a God, which you believe purely upon your own reason, than of transubstantiation, purgatory, or whatever you believe upon the authority of your church?

And to say, that God is obliged to give every man an outward infallible guide, is making too bold with Providence, and measuring his infinite wisdom and goodness by our short line. He has made creatures as it has pleased him. Some incapable of happiness or misery, as the inanimates; some capable only of pleasures or pain of sense, as animals; and he has endowed others with reason, as man, and, "left him in the hand of his own counsel, set good and evil, life and death before him, and free will to choose which liketh him."* Again, of rational creatures, some he has fixed in happiness, as the blessed of heaven; others are vessels of wrath, as the angels that fell. But man is betwixt these two, to work out his own salvation by his obedience to the will of God; who will judge every man according to what he has given him. "For as many as have sinned without the law, shall be judged without the law; as they that have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; for there is no respect of persons with God."† But according to your argument there is great respect of persons with him, and his goodness has

* Deut. xi. 26; xx. 15; Eccus. xv. 14, &c. † Rom. ii. 11, 12.

failed the far greatest part of mankind from the beginning of the world; for what outward guide is there to Jews, Heathens, Mahometans, and Christians; and to the many subdivisions among all these? And all these have guides of their own, and the blind lead the blind with most of them. For it is fact that the generality of mankind do not choose for themselves, but take their religion upon trust as they are educated. And we must leave all this to God, who will require from none more than he has given; for "the Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works."*

13. *Lord*—Can any be saved then, but by Christ?

Gentleman—No; but many may be saved by him who never heard of him. He died to make satisfaction to the infinite justice for the sins of the whole world; and took our nature upon him, to atone for our fallen nature, to be applied to such who perform the conditions required. He will judge the Gentiles by the law of morality, which he has planted in their hearts, and we call natural religion; but from Christians he requires faith in Christ, joined with sincere repentance.

Lord—Then the Gentiles are in better condition than we, because less is required of them.

Gentleman—Is it no advantage then, to have the "Glory of God" revealed to us, "in the face of Jesus Christ?"† As the apostle speaks, and the effect of it upon us is described, "That we all with open face, beholding, as in a glass, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." The sight of the wonderful economy of our redemption must needs fill our souls with rapture and joy, when we behold the glory of God in all his attributes, each exalting the other to the uttermost, as it is said, James ii. 13. *Misericordia superexaltat judicium*, that the "mercy of God exalts his justice." For justice requires full satisfaction, it cannot remit a farthing; to remit is mercy and not justice; and God is justice itself, justice in the abstract. Here then infinite wisdom finds out a full satisfaction to infinite justice; and infinite goodness affords that satisfaction, by the incarnation, perfect obedience, meritorious passion, and glorious resurrection, &c.

* Psalm cxlv. 9.

† 2 Cor. iv. 6.; chap. iii. v. 18.

of the only begotten Son of God! This enflames our devotion, invigorates our obedience, and gives compunction to our repentance, when we "have sinned and come short of the glory of God."* God has vouchsafed to make a covenant with us in Christ, by virtue of which we may appeal to his justice and veracity. It is a pardon signed and sealed by the king, which we may plead in court. The heathen have not this, but they are still under his mercy, they may say, God is merciful to forgive us. But we may say with St. John, that God "is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."† This is a great, a very great advantage we have above the Gentiles. And may not we enjoy it with great thankfulness, and not damn them all to the pit of hell? Because God has made a covenant with us, may we not leave them to his uncovenanted mercy? Is our eye evil to them, because he has been good to us? Or, would we limit his mercies to his creatures, with whom we have nothing to do? "For what have we to do to judge them that are without?—Them that are without God judgeth."‡ And God did judge one who was without, that is, out of the pale of the church, to be the most beloved of God, and that "there was none like him in the earth."§ And he is put upon the level with the greatest in the church, "Though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it,"|| &c. And as God chose a Gentile to be the great example of patience to all ages.¶ And of another Gentile it was said by Christ, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."** And he who said often to his disciples, "O ye of little faith,"†† and upbraided his apostles with their unbelief; yet said to a woman of Canaan, (who would not be discouraged for the objection he put against her, of her not being within the pale of the church, but without among the dogs,) "O woman great is thy faith."‡‡ And of the ten healed there was but one thankful, and he was a Samaritan, that is, a Schismatic,§§ a stranger, as Christ here calls him, and said to him, "thy faith hath made thee whole." And the pattern of charity is placed in the person of a Samaritan, in opposition to both a priest and a Levite;||| which makes good what St. Peter said of Cornelius a Gentile, "Of a truth I perceive that

* Rom. iii. 23. † 1 John i. 9. ‡ 1 Cor. v. 12. § Job i. 8.
 || Ezek. xiv. 14. ¶ James v. 11. ** Luke vii. 9. †† Mark xvi. 14.
 ‡‡ Matt. xv. 26. §§ Luke xvii. 16; v. 18. ||| Luke x. 30.

God is no respecter of persons ; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.* This is the doctrine which Christ taught, Luke iv. 25, &c. when he minded the Jews, that a widow of Sarepta, a city of Sidon, and Naaman the Syrian were preferred to all the widows and lepers in Israel ; which so enraged the Jews, tenacious of the privilege of the church, that they “ thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill (whereon their city was built) that they might cast him down headlong.” And it is said that they were “ filled with wrath.” The like fury they showed when St. Paul told them that the Gospel was to be extended beyond the pale of their church, and that God had sent him to the Gentiles : “ And they gave him audience unto that word, and then lift up their voices, and said, away with such a fellow from the earth ; for it is not fit that he should live. And they cried out, and cast off their clothes, and threw dust in the air.”† And the like rage is seen among the zealots of your church, when they hear of the Gospel being extended out of the pale of their communion ; though with Christians who hold the three ancient creeds, and have every thing essential to a church, except what Rome has made so, viz. The universal and unlimited sovereignty of her bishop : which is the great bone of contention, wherein Rome stands single by herself, trusting all other Christian Churches from her ; like a man in a boat who thinks he trusts the shore from him, whereas he only trusts himself from the shore ; as Firmilian said to Stephen bishop of Rome, *Excidisti te ipsum, noli te fallere*,—“ Do not deceive yourself, you have cut yourself off from the church ; for he is truly a schismatic who has made himself an apostate from the communion of ecclesiastical unity ; for while you think you can excommunicate all other churches from you, you have only excommunicated yourself from them. *Dum enim putas omnes à te abstineri posse, te ipsum abstinuisti.*” Cyprian Ep. 75. 228. Edit. Oxon.

But the Church of the Jews had a much stronger plea for universal supremacy and infallibility, because all proselytes, of whatever nations, must come into her ; for there was no other visible church of God upon earth, and the sacrifices were limited to the temple at Jerusalem : accord-

* Acts. x. 34.

† Acts xxii. 22.

ingly we find, Acts viii. 27, that the Eunuch came out of *Æthiopia* to Jerusalem for to worship.

Now if the Christian sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, the most solemn worship of God, were confined to St. Peter's Church at Rome, and could be had no where else; as the most solemn worship of God, the legal sacrifices, which were types of the Christian, were confined to the temple of Jerusalem: and if the Church of Rome, like that of the Jews, were the only church in the world; yet after all, would the Church of Rome have no more pretence to infallibility and perpetuity than the church of the Jews had. And as the church of the Jews has been cut off, for her disobedience to the law of God; so (as before mentioned) has it been said to the Church of Rome particularly, "Thou also shalt be cut off,"* that is, upon the same condition, "if thou continue not in the goodness of God." And we cannot imagine there should be a Church of Rome visibly as now, with a Pope at the head of it, and a number of bishops, cardinals, &c. under him, holding the true Christian faith, when that time comes which our Saviour has foretold, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?"† For then it would be found, and very visibly at Rome.

But that state of the church is better represented by the seven thousand who had not bowed to Baal, but of whom Elijah knew none, but thought he was left alone.‡ This was a state of segregation; there were particular persons who kept the faith, but invisible to the world, or to one another; without any public worship, or so much as private meetings; for Elijah would surely have known of these, and been the principal among them; far less could they have had an organised church, with pastors and rulers over them, without being known to Elijah, and to many more, even to their persecutors: who found out the most private recesses of the primitive Christians, and their meetings, though in the most secret manner, for divine worship; and their bishops too, whom they seized and hauled to prisons and to martyrdom, for they could not lie hid, and the faith was then visible, though under persecution. Therefore it must be a much more universal depravity and corruption of the Church of which our Saviour spoke, when faith should not be found, at least

* Rom. xi. 22.

† Luke xviii. 8.

‡ Rom. xi. 3, 4.

visibly, upon the earth. It will be more like the state of the church before the flood, represented by the ark, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved.* And as the corruption of the old world was great, we may suppose the corruption to be greater before the second coming of Christ, as the destruction by fire is more terrible than that by water. However such an universal corruption is here foretold, as will in no ways consist with the least sort of that visibility which the Church of Rome requires as a mark of the true Church, and to continue with her for ever.

But on the other hand, if there shall be a visible church in those days, then that church, at least the generality, which is the visibility of it, will fall from the faith, else it would be visibly to be found upon the earth; and then men will be misled by the church, and by those marks of visibility, &c. which the Church of Rome gives her; in like manner as they were misled by the church before, when she commanded them to reject their Messiah. He came first unto his own, the church of the Jews, the only visible church then upon the earth, but she "received him not;"† for she was corrupt and blinded, under the mask of pharisaical sanctity, and strict observance of the law, even to the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin; she was zealous in the outward observances, but neglected the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith;‡ and so it may be at the second coming of Christ, as it was at the first; for there is no more promise of infallibility to the one state of the church, than to the other.

Lord—But it was prophesied in the Old Testament, that the Jews should reject their Messiah at his first coming.

Gentleman—And in the New Testament, that at his second coming he should not find faith upon the earth.

But the Jews did not so understand these prophecies against themselves; they said that the church was the only interpreter of Scripture, and they must take the law from the mouth of their priests; and the church did interpret these Scriptures otherwise than Christ did.

Lord—But Christ being come, he was then the church.

Gentleman—He was not the church, for he came to

* 1 Pet. iii. 20.

† John i. 11.

‡ Matt. xxiii. 23.

redeem the church ; he did not come to redeem himself. He was the head ; the church, the body ; but the head is not the body.

Besides, it is perfectly begging the question of the Jews, to suppose that Christ was the Messiah, for that they deny, and bid us prove it ; that is the whole question betwixt them and us.

Lord—His heavenly doctrine, his miracles, and the prophecies of him, prove him to be the Messiah.

Gentleman—The Jews answer all this by the authority of the church, which said, “Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him? But this people who knoweth not the law are cursed.”* And to rivet this curse, they excommunicated those who did confess Christ ;† and they said, that Christ wrought his miracles by Beelzebub ;‡ and who was to be judge in this case, the people or the church? Upon the foot of the authority of the church, it was impossible at that time for any to be a Christian. Therefore of all men, Christians have the least reason to insist upon this.

14. *Lord*—Then I find you resolve all upon private judgment.

Gentleman—It is all we have for the belief of a God, or of Christ, and by your own confession, for the choice of a church. And then we may well trust to it in smaller matters ; in short, we must trust to it in every thing without exception ; for it is as impossible to believe any thing without our understanding, as to see without our eyes.

Lord—But you believe some mysteries which you pretend not to understand or explain, as the doctrine of the holy Trinity, the Incarnation, &c.

Gentleman—My reason tells me, that there must be many things in the nature of God which I cannot understand or explain, because he is infinite and incomprehensible. And these I take purely upon the revelation that is given of them in the holy Scriptures, for my own reason could never have found them out, nor can perfectly understand them. They are dark to me, like a country I never saw, I cannot have a right idea of it till I come thither ; as I cannot of heaven, or of the state of separate souls ;

* John vii. 48, 49. † John ix. 22, 34 ; xvi. 2. ‡ Matt. ix. 34 ; xii. 24.

yet I cannot help framing some conception to myself, of what I know never entered into the heart of man to conceive, that is, aright, and according as these things are. Therefore I take not upon me to explain them, for that would be to involve myself, and I know that I must greatly err. And yet it would be as much against reason to deny these things, as to deny there was any country in the world, or star in the firmament, which I had not seen. And much more unreasonable it would be, to think there was nothing in the nature of the infinite Being which I did not comprehend; or because that cannot be expressed to us, but in words adapted to our understanding, therefore to measure his nature by ours; and because Peter, James, and John are three men, therefore to think that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost must be three Gods. But when I say three persons, with relation to the divine Trinity, there comes not such a thought in my head as three persons of men; but because personal actions are attributed to each of the divine three, therefore we call them persons, which word the Scripture applies to God, Heb. i. 3. But it is only *ad captum*, as the schools speak, that is, condescending to our capacity, as when God is said to repent, to grieve, &c. it is not that we should think it really so, for that would be contradictory to the nature of God; but it conveys a notion to us, that we should act as if it were so, that God were angry or grieved at our sins, and would repent of the blessings he had given or promised to us, if we took not heed to walk in his ways which he has set before us.

15. *Lord*—I am afraid the Deists will think this a straining the point in favour of Revelation, and say that they are much easier without it.

Gentleman—They will not find it so when they consider that they are in no less difficulties upon following their own reason only; for example, they allow a first cause and creator of all things, because nothing can make itself; and that first cause must have a necessary being, and consequently from all eternity; and that eternity is a duration without succession or time, or having any beginning, wherein all is present, without either past or to come: this the Deist is forced to confess upon the conviction of his reason. But he will not pretend to have so much as any idea or conception what this eternity is or can be,

nor can he imagine a duration without beginning, in which there is nothing past, or any thing to come: nor can he express this any otherwise than in words of time, which he must own are not at all proper or applicable to it; the very word beginning is inconsistent with eternity, and to say before the beginning, is a contradiction. Here then he is lost, and must have recourse to the same excuse which he ridicules in revelation, viz. That we cannot speak properly of God, nor in other words than what belong to men, and therefore that these words are not to be taken strictly, nor argued upon, or consequences drawn from them, for that this would involve us in numberless contradictions. And there is not one objection which the Deist or Socinian makes against the doctrine of the holy Trinity, the Incarnation, &c., but are of this sort, by arguing from the nature of man to the nature of God, from the persons of the one to the persons of the other, &c., which these men of reason think highly unreasonable in their own case, as to argue from time to eternity, &c.

16. *Lord*—But, Sir, the Deist would ask you, upon what authority you believe that revelation, viz. of the Scriptures? And since you will not have it built upon the authority of the church, I see not what other authority you can allege for it.

Gentleman—Nor I neither, for I put it upon no authority; it is evidence and not authority, upon which my belief of the Scriptures is founded.

Lord—Then you believe upon the authority of evidence.

Gentleman—That expression is not proper, though sometimes carelessly used; for authority and evidence are two things. If I believe a thing, for your telling me so, without any other reason, then I believe it purely upon your authority; but if a man I never saw before, makes a thing very evident to me, and convinces my reason, I believe not then upon his authority, for he has none with me, but upon the evidence he has given me; and what that evidence is upon which we believe the holy Scriptures is set forth in a little book I had the honour to present to your Lordship, entitled, “The Truth of Christianity Demonstrated,” &c., which was wrote to convince Deists, who believe no church, or any church authority. And if you have no other evidence but the authority of your church to prove the truth of the Scriptures, I

see not how you will ever convince a Deist, who denies both.

But if I tell him that I believe the Scriptures, and the facts therein related, upon the same, and much stronger evidence than I have for believing there was such a man as Alexander or Cæsar, that there is such a town as Rome or Constantinople, though I was never there : yet I believe it, not upon the authority, far less the infallibility of any man or number of men, that tell me so ; but from the nature of the evidence which makes it impossible for mankind to concert such a lie, or to carry it on without being detected : and if the truth of Christianity, that is, of the Scriptures, can be demonstrated as plainly as these other facts, (which I think is done in the book I mentioned,) then a Deist must either be convinced or confounded.

Now if you will let your church come in as part of the evidence of Christianity, she will not be refused, so far as her share goes ; but upon her authority, and upon her's alone, the truth of the Scriptures and of Christianity, will be a jest to the Deists ; since her authority can be proved no otherwise than by the Scriptures, and then back again, the Scriptures by her authority !

Lord—But several parts of the Scriptures have been disputed, as you reject those books you call apocryphal out of the canon of the Old Testament ; and the ancient heretics forged false gospels and false epistles in the names of the apostles ; and as the canon of the New Testament now stands, some of the epistles have been disputed by some learned men ; and this could not be determined, nor the canon established, but by the authority of the church.

Gentleman—As to the Apocryphal books, we received the canon of the Old Testament from the church of the Jews, which never admitted them into the canon of their Scriptures. And how should we know their canon better than themselves ?

Again we are sure they were not in the Christian Canon in the days of St. Jerome, if he knew what was received by the church as the canon of Scripture ; for in his *Prologus Galeatus*, printed before your own *Vulgar Latin*, he rejects them as apocryphal,* and says they were not in the canon of the holy Scriptures.

* *Inter Apocrypha esse ponenda—Non sunt in canone.*

But as to these books themselves, let any one but read the conclusion of them, in excuse for the weakness of the performance, and then think it possible, if he can, that the Holy Ghost should make such a speech as this—"If I have done well, it is what I desired, but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto."* Or as your Vulgar has it, *Si quidum bene et ut Historiæ competit, hoc et ipse velim; Si autem minus dignè, concedendum est mihi*; that is, "I ask your pardon, if I have not done my work as it ought to be."

But as to a full examination of the Apocryphal books, and their authority, I refer your Lordship to Dr. Cosin's Scholastical History of the Canon of the Holy Scripture. Printed 1657. And not yet answered that I can hear of.

Lord—But the canon of the New Testament was established upon the authority of the church.

Gentleman—No, my lord, not at all by her authority, but plainly by evidence; they proceeded wholly upon evidence, viz. whether such an epistle was sent to such a church, as to the church of Corinth, Ephesus, Galatia, &c. Who carefully kept the originals, and sent copies to other churches, as was commanded, Col. iv. 16. And by this communication of the churches one with another, the true Scriptures were known, and it is commonly set down at the end of the epistles by what hand they were sent. And by this method the spurious epistles and Gospels forged by heretics were at first detected, as you will find in the last chapter of the fifth book of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, where it is told, that the heretics were brought to this test, and could not produce the originals whence they took their copies; and that their copies did vary from one another, every one adding what opinion came into his own head; and that they could not tell from whom they had learned such new doctrines. Thus the canon of the New Testament was settled in those ages when these evidences were fresh and notorious; and has been received since that time by all the Christian churches in the world, so unanimously, that there is no dispute betwixt any churches concerning the canon of the New Testament. And this is an evidence too strong for the caprice of some particular men, who would shew their wit in making objections against this or that part. But

* Macc. xv. 38.

this cannot hurt the faith, because the whole faith is over and over again fully expressed and contained in those Gospels and epistles which are acknowledged by all.

Lord—But there are various lections and translations of the Scriptures into many languages, which agree not exactly, and in every point, with one another. And how shall we examine this by evidence? What evidence is there in this case? Here the authority of the church must come in to determine between these various lections and translations: and these various lections or different readings of several texts are very many, which some learned men have taken pains to collect.

Gentleman—But there is no difference among them in any thing material or what concerns the faith. So that this, instead of an objection (which the Deists make use of to invalidate the truth of the Scriptures, and the certainty of our faith,) proves a stronger confirmation of both, in that among so many various readings and translations no material difference is found; or other than may, and without a miracle must, happen in so many thousand copies and impressions as have been made of the Scriptures. And none I suppose will pretend that every writer or printer is infallible, not to mistake a letter or word, or misplace them. But that nothing of this sort has happened to the detriment of the faith, or making disputes in any thing that is material must be attributed to a very particular Providence.

And the Church of Rome has not undertaken, nor was it worth her while, to attempt the adjusting of the various readings; for in that translation which she has most approved, the Vulgar Latin, some of the various lections are given on the margin of her own editions.

But what signifies the Latin, which is not the vulgar language of any nation now in the world; I say what does this signify to the people who understand it not?

Lord—Therefore to answer your objections of our locking up the Scriptures from the people, we have them now translated into the vulgar tongues of each country, particularly in France, where they are publicly sold in the shops.

Gentleman—This, instead of an answer to the objection, is a confessing to it, and owning it to have been just and necessary. And thus much your people have gained by our reformation.

But alas, my Lord, what have they gained? There is something worse than even a total locking up the Scriptures in these translations, that is, a corrupting the text to deceive the people, different from even your own vulgar Latin translation, which you have authorized. This is made apparent in the collection, printed here at London, of the many texts thus evidently abused, both by adding to them and taking from them, and misinterpreting them; in the French New Testament printed in France for the use of the new converts there. And this has occasioned the suppression of that New Testament, insomuch that few of them are to be found, at least they are not publicly sold now at Paris.

Lord—If they are suppressed, then your complaints are answered. But have you any objection against the Louvian translation now printed and sold at Paris, with the approbation of the doctors and divines there?

Gentleman—Yes, my Lord, here is one in my hand, bought in Rue St. Jaques in Paris, where they are printed, with the approbations before them in the year 1701. And in this translation there are many mistranslations. I will show your Lordship one.* it is said, “As they ministered to the Lord.” The vulgar Latin has it in the same words, *Ministrantibus illis Domino*. But this French translation is in these words, *Or comme ils offroient au Seigneur le Sacrifice de la Messe*. “When they had offered to the Lord the sacrifice of the mass.”

Lord—I suppose they took that to be the meaning of the words.

Gentleman—Your Lordship may suppose so. But, my Lord, what the import of the words is, or what consequences may be drawn from them, is what we call exposition or commenting upon the text; but to alter the words of the text is of another nature, it is false translation, and not an interpretation; and comes under that terrible curse pronounced Rev. xxii. 18, 19, against those who add to, detract from, or pervert the words of holy Scripture.

And to show that this was not done by chance, and what use they intended to make of this text thus translated, Acts xiii. 2, they put upon the margin, *la sainte Messe*, “the holy Mass.” That the people might here

* Acts xiii. 2.

find a plain text of Scripture for the mass and the sacrifice of it. And in the index (which is done by the same authority as the translation) upon the word *Messe*, this text is named as a proof that the apostles did celebrate mass.

This sacrifice of the mass is a plain addition to the text. Let me give one instance of subtracting from it. It is said, "that Jacob worshipped *ἐπὶ* upon, or leaning upon the top of his staff."* But this French translation leaves out the word *ἐπὶ upon*, and renders it, that he "worshipped the top of his staff." *Adora le Haut de son Baton*. And in the index at the word adoration, this text is quoted for the adoration of wood, *L'Adoration fait aux Bois*. Heb. xi. 21. Belike they thought there was some image carved or painted on the top of Jacob's staff which he worshipped! And so this is made a text for worshipping their wooden images and pictures; especially the solemn worship of the cross every Good Friday. And who knows but that the head of Jacob's staff was not round, but crutchways, set a-cross, (as is usual with old men) and then the staff was a perfect cross!

In the former text concerning the Mass, this French translation adds to the words of their own Vulgar Latin, as well as of the original; but in this last the Vulgar Latin as well as the French, subtract from the original, and both render this text the same way.

But, to do justice to all, the Port-Royal Bible delivers this text from the gross interpretation put upon it by means of a false translation, to favour the worshipping of wood.

In the other French translation I mentioned before, made for the use of the new converts, this expression, 1 Cor. iii. 15, of some that shall be saved with great difficulty, as if passing through the fire, is boldly rendered, the fire of purgatory, as the words of the text, without any different character, as is used with us when a word is put in to make English of an Hebrew or Greek idiom. But in this Louvian translation, the text is let stand, "so as by fire," only *purgatorie* is put on the margin in this edition made since the objections against the other translation, in which the addition of "purgatory" to this text is particularly taken notice of.

* Heb. xi. 21.

I could give your Lordship more of the corruptions of texts in the French translations. I have now only named three, one for the sacrifice of the mass, another for the adoration of the cross and of images, and one for purgatory.

Lord—The church is not answerable for these translations, however approved and recommended by Doctors, Universities, &c.

17. *Gentleman*—But the people are deceived by them. The people believe as they are taught. There is small security to them in the abstruse disputes concerning infallibility, how far it extends, and where it is placed, and in the disputes betwixt popes and councils about it. These are questions of which I suppose your Lordship will easily grant the common people are no judges. They know nothing of the matter. How should they, when the learned men are divided among themselves concerning them? So that this infallibility, if it could be found and fixed, would be of little use to the generality of the people, unless their curates, and their fathers and mothers who instruct them, were likewise all of them infallible, for, as I said, they believe as they are taught, and examine no farther. Nay, they are forbid to examine, for that implies a doubt, and they are not to doubt of the religion they are taught, but to receive, without any doubt, what has been told them by their curates, fathers, mothers, or nurses, and what is current in the country where they live. This is all the infallibility of which they are capable. And this is the way of all the earth. It is thus that the generality of mankind, whether Heathens, Jews, Mahometans, or Christians, receive their religion. And without examining into what we have been taught, no man could change his religion. None could ever have become a Christian, especially no Jew, who had the authority of his church against Christ, to which church he alleges promises of perpetuity and infallibility.

18. *Lord*—The Bishop of Meaux has cleared this in his conference with Mr. Cloud, where the bishop asserts the necessity of a living infallible judge always in being to direct men. And says, that when Christ was come, he was that living judge, and so the authority of the Jewish church was superseded.

Gentleman—This is *gratus dictum*, and begging the question of the Jew, as I have said already, who upon the authority of his church denies our Christ to have been the Messiah. I will not repeat, only ask these few questions farther. 1. Who was this living judge before the flood? for the bishop says, there must be always such an one in being. 2. Was Abraham, who was known only to a few neighbours, and wrought no miracles to convince others; was he, I say, given as such a guide or judge to the whole earth? And Christ was not so great a traveller as Abraham. 3. Where was this living judge when Christ was dead? And if there was none for three days, it might be so for three, or three hundred years, or for good and all, because the argument fails for the necessity of such a judge always in being. You will not say the church can fail for three days; the promises of God can never fail, no not for a moment.

Lord—Christ founded his church before he died, and left his apostles for guides, chiefly Peter, the prince and principle of unity to them all.

Gentleman—And yet of the apostles one betrayed him, another foreswore him (and that was Peter), all forsook him.

Lord—That was human frailty, and personal; but they retained the true faith, they were in no error as to that.

Gentleman—The greatest that could be, “For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that he must rise again from the dead.”* And “if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins.”† And the reason given for choosing Matthias into the room of Judas, was, “that he might be a witness with the other apostles of the resurrection of Christ.”‡ And what faith could they have in him whom they had quite given over, and never expected to see him more? “They trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel.”|| But when he was dead, all their hopes were gone, they expected no redemption from him. This was far from a Christian faith, and could there be a Christian church without this faith?

To avoid all this, and secure the promise of indefectibility to the church, some of your authors of greatest

* John xx. 9. † 1 Cor. xv. 17. ‡ Acts i. 22. || Luke xxiv. 21.

name have said, that the church was then preserved in the Virgin Mary; and thence infer that the catholic church may be preserved in one woman, as it was then, and that so it may be again in the times of antichrist, and the great defection is foretold will be before the second coming of Christ, when faith shall not be found upon the earth, that is very hardly, when it may be confined to one laic, a woman, or a baptised infant, as others of your doctors* allow.

Lord—This is giving up the church quite, as a society, with government, discipline, &c., and I hardly believe any of our approved authors have said so much, and not been censured for it.

Gentleman—They are no less men than Alensis, the author of the Gloss, upon the Decretals, Lyra, Occam, Alliaco, Panormitan, Turrecremata, Peter de Monte, St. Antoninus, Cusanus, Clemangis, Jacobatius, J. Fr. Picus, &c. And to save repetition, your Lordship will find their books and words quoted in this small treatise, in my hand entituled, “The Incurable Scepticism of the Church of Rome,” printed here, 1688, p. 22, &c. I name this little tract because it is short, and will give your Lordship no great trouble, and proceeds upon the same argument I have undertaken with your Lordship, instead of the particular points in dispute betwixt the Church of Rome and us, as invocation of saints, purgatory, &c., to go at once to the bottom of the cause, and examine the ground and foundation of faith, as taught in the Church of Rome; which is showed, I think to a demonstration to be wholly precarious and uncertain; and that there is no greater difference and confusion among any sort of men, upon any subject whatsoever, than there is among the divines of the Church of Rome, concerning her rule of faith, and infallible judge of controversy. And every one of the different opinions about it is in flat contradiction to all the others, so that if any one of them be true, all the rest must be false; and yet they all pretend to believe with divine faith, and think it necessary in this case, because it is the foundation of their faith.

Now if according to these learned doctors, the whole church failed upon our Saviour's death, then the gates of hell did prevail for a time; and if the Virgin Mary were

* Bannes com. in 2. 2 Quest. in Art. Dub. 1.

excepted, that would not do much as to the standing of the church. But have they any revelation to ground divine faith upon, or upon what grounds do they believe that the Virgin Mary knew the Scriptures, or the resurrection of Christ, more than the apostles, and was not under the same despondency as they were? This seems to be that sword which Simeon told her should "pierce through her own soul also."*

Lord—To avoid all these things, some suppose that the Christian Church was not formed till the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, when Peter converted about three thousand, as told in the 2d of the Acts. And that of this Christ spoke, when he told Peter that he would build his church upon him, and called him a rock, and that it was fulfilled at this time, when Peter was made the instrument of that first and great conversion, which was the foundation of all that followed.

Gentleman—If the Christian church was not formed, as some think, until after the resurrection, because our redemption was not till then completed; or, as others think, till the ascension, when Christ commissioned his apostles "to go and teach all nations;"† or till the descent of the Holy Ghost, when they were "endued with power from on high;"‡ yet any of these ways it will follow that there was no Christian church before the death of Christ; and then that the Jewish was the only true Church while Christ lived in the world; for the Jewish Church was to last till the Christian was formed, else there was no church at all after Christ came, till his resurrection. And then it would follow, that the only true church in the world, did reject our Christ; and then there will be no choice left us, but either to acknowledge the fallibility of the church, or to reject Christ from being the Messiah. But if the Christian church was formed upon the first appearance of Christ in the world, or upon his ordaining the twelve apostles, and sending them out to preach, or upon any other act done in his life; then, as said before, the whole church failed upon his death. But if the church cannot fail, no not for a moment, because of the necessity of a living infallible judge always in being, the succession of the monarchy of the church ought to be hereditary, where the king never dies. For this scheme will not admit of a

* Luke ii. 35.

† Matt. xxviii. 19.

‡ Luke xxiv. 49.

interregnum for months or years that may be spent in the election of a pope, in all which time the church has no head or monarch; much less when there are popes and anti-popes, which has occasioned twenty-six schisms in the Church of Rome, some of them of long continuance. And who is judge in such a case? is every man left to his own private judgment? and is it all one which of the contending popes he adheres to, whether to the right or the wrong? or can the church have two or three opposite heads at the same time?

Lord—Therefore in France, where I received my education, they place not the infallibility in the pope, but in a general council.

Gentleman—I told your Lordship before, that there never was a council truly general; that there are disputes in your church concerning general councils, some receiving those, or parts of them which others reject; and who shall be judge in this case?

But suppose you were agreed among yourselves concerning your councils, and that they were infallible, yet they are not a living judge always in being; you have not had one since that of Trent, which began in the year 1545, and concluded in the year 1563; now a hundred and fifty years ago; and there may not be another in twice that time, if ever; where then is the living judge always in being, which the Bishop of Meaux and others think necessary?

Lord—General councils may in this sense be called living, and always in being, that their canons are always in being, and determine controversies to those who regard them; and if new heresies, or controversies, or schisms of popes arise, new councils may be called to determine them.

Gentleman—And ages may pass before that can be done; and the church may be corrupted in the mean time for want of such a living judge. As Europe is now situated it would be pretty difficult to have a general council; and it may be long enough before any pope may be of opinion to call one, or hazard his supremacy upon it.

19. But, my Lord, the canons of past councils are not living, nor can speak for themselves. There are volumes printed of the learned in your own communion giving

contrary expositions of the canons. I will instance in one, the third canon of the fourth, commonly called the great council of Lateran, acknowledged to be a true general council by all of the Church of Rome, established in most express and positive terms, the Pope's power of deposing princes, and absolving their subjects from their allegiance, not only if he please to call them heretics themselves, but if they do not extirpate all heretics out of their dominions. This is maintained in the literal sense by Bellarmin and the Italian doctors. On the other hand, the Gallilean church who have condemned the deposing doctrine, and yet own this council of Lateran, are put to hard shifts, and many distinctions to solve this; but it is impossible, for either that doctrine must be true, or this council has greatly erred.

Lord—But not in faith. This is no matter of faith.

Gentleman—But is it not matter of salvation, for which we shall be judged at the last day? St. Paul says, "They that resist the (lawful) powers, shall receive to themselves damnation."* "Wherefore (says he, ver. 5,) ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, (or fear of temporal punishment from these powers,) but also for conscience sake," that is towards God. And what are these guides of conscience who lead us wrong in this? In the description of the last judgment given by Christ, Matt. xxv. 31 to the end, men shall be judged chiefly for their practice; there is nothing mentioned there but what men have done. And have we no guide as to practice, while we raise such contentions about a guide in faith? or is the church a guide in practice too? and is a general council the church? Then the church has led us into a damnable practice, unless the Pope has power to depose princes at his pleasure, and that there is no sin in rebellion, and all the blood and desolation that follow it, if his holiness so command!

Lord—But the church does not oblige us to profess or subscribe the deposing doctrine, no, nor to believe it, so that you may be a good Roman Catholic, notwithstanding all this. Nay, you may oppose the deposing doctrine, as the clergy of France do.

Gentleman—And may I not be as good a Roman Catholic if I do believe it, and defend it, and practice it too?

* Rom. xiii. 2.

And have I not all the encouragement the Church of Rome can give me, the frequent practice of the Popes themselves, and here the canon of a general council for it? And have any of the Popes ever yet renounced it?

Lord—But the doctors do not agree about the sense of that canon. You see France takes it in a quite contrary sense from the Pope and Italian doctors.

Gentleman—Then your Lordship sees that canons are but a dead letter, and that there may be disputes about them. And where then is the living infallible judge always in being? You see the canons of former councils cannot be this judge. There must be another judge to determine what the true sense of them is. And who should that judge be but the Pope the head of the church? I am sure if I were a Roman Catholic I should be on that side. I could show your Lordship several other canons of councils that are in dispute among your own doctors; but that can be no wonder, when I have already showed, they are in dispute about the councils themselves. So that there is no certainty, what the judgment of your church is. Or rather it is certain that it is most erroneous, and in matters that concern our eternal salvation, as well as the peace of the world, that is, rebellion, (among other things) which is as witchcraft and idolatry. I have instanced in this sin, because I know your Lordship to be tenacious of your loyalty.

And now, my Lord, since the saving of our souls is the end for our being of any church, I leave your Lordship to judge, whether the people are safest in the communion of Rome, or of the Church of England, as to this point?

20. *Lord*—They are safe in the Church of France, where the deposing doctrine is disowned.

Gentleman—My Lord, our dispute is with the Church of Rome. And if the Church of France differs from the Church of Rome, in matters whereon our salvation depends, they cannot be said to be one church, or to have the same guides to heaven.

But, my Lord, the Pope's deposing power has extended itself even to France, of which you will find frequent instances in their histories. And even so late as the holy league against Henry III. all the Popes in that time joined with the league against the king, and supported that

rebellion by their authority. And the generality of the bishops and clergy of France, and their universities, took part with the league, and justified it by principle and in print; the book *de justâ Abdicatione Henrici III.* "Of the just Abdication of Henry III., King of France," was then wrote upon the foot of the deposing power, not only of the Pope, but also of the people. And D'Avila in his history of these civil wars in France tells,* "A great and solemn procession was made by order from the Cardinal Legate, to implore God's assistance (for the success of the league against the king) in which the prelates, priests, and monks of the several religious orders, walked all in their accustomed habits; but besides them, armed openly with corslets, guns, swords, partisans, and all kind of arms offensive and defensive, making at once a double show, both of devotion and constancy of heart, to defend themselves. Which ceremony, though to many it seemed indecent and ridiculous, yet was of great use to augment and confirm the courage of the common people."

And the Cardinal Legate says in the declaration he published to the leaguers,† "that to acknowledge an heretic for their king, is the dream of a madman, which proceeds from nothing else but heretical contagion."

And the leaguers show wherein they placed their confidence, and say,‡ "They are the most holy fathers, (the Popes) and the most holy see that have sent us relief; and though many have been called to that supreme dignity (of the popedom) since these last troubles, yet hath there not been one of them who hath changed his affection towards us; a most certain testimony that our cause is just.

And there had been six Popes during the league, viz. Gregory XIII., Sixtus V., Urban VII., Gregory XIV., Innocent IX., and Clement VIII. And they supported that rebellion, not only with their blessing on it, and the authors of it, and cursing the king and all the loyal subjects who adhered to him; but they sent more substantial relief, viz. three hundred thousand crowns for the service of the Cardinal of Bourbon,|| whom they had chosen king,

* D'Avila History of the Civil Wars of France. English Translation, printed in the Savoy, 1678. Lib. XI. p. 459.

† Ibid. Lib. XIII. p. 578. ‡ Ibid. p. 598. || Ibid. Lib. XII. p. 493, 501, 503.

by the name of Charles the Tenth, against the next in blood, only because he was a Protestant; and fifteen thousand crowns a month to carry on that rebellion, with an army of six thousand foot, and one thousand two hundred horse to assist these holy leaguers. The Pope went heart and hand into this work, "which he accounted excellently good, (says D'Avila,*) and of wonderful glory and advancement to the apostolic see." And afterwards, when the success of the king's arms had induced several of the clergy and others to come over to him, the Pope sent his monitory letters to the prelates and catholics, commanding them,† "under pain of excommunication, and of being deprived of their dignities and benefices, and of being used as sectaries and heretics, that they should withdraw themselves from those places that yielded obedience to Henry of Bourbon, (so he styled the king) and from the union and fellowship of his faction." And the authority of the Pope prevailed so far at last, that those catholics who had joined with the king formed a conspiracy against him, upon his delay of his changing his religion, wherein the princes of the blood were most violent, and told him plainly to his face, that if he did not perform his promise, (to turn Roman Catholic,) they would desert him, and join with the league. See D'Avila, p. 611, 612, as likewise, 555, 601, 605.

After his conversion, and being by that established upon the throne, they feared his power, and therefore the Pope, (as now) made less noise with the deposing doctrine, which yet he would not disown, but kept it *in petto* till a more fitting opportunity. But yet it was not carried so covertly, but that, even in their sermons, wise and willing men might know their meaning.‡ Ravallac upon his examination, alleged the Lent sermons before his assassination of King Henry IV., as the ground and encouragement to that execrable fact. But after that magnanimous prince had thus fallen a sacrifice to their restless furious zeal, and his son succeeded young and defenceless to the government, then they set up again the deposing doctrine on high, because then they durst do it. With which our king James does justly upbraid them, particularly his

* Lib. XI. p. 431.

† Lib. XIII. p. 613.

‡ See King James I., his defence of the Right of Kings against Cardinal Perron, page 4.

opponent, the Cardinal Perron, in the preface to his book quoted on the margin ; for it was but five years after the murder of Henry IV. viz. A.D. 1615, that Cardinal Perron, in the assembly of the three estates of France, and in the name of the first estate, that is, of the clergy, did re-assert the power of the Pope to depose kings, with this reason, that otherwise, "there had not been any church for many ages past ; and that indeed the church (he meant of Rome) was the very synagogue of anti-Christ."

But to come to a fresh instance now on foot, the Pere Juvency, a French Jesuit, has lately printed a book at Rome in defence of the Pope's power to depose princes. And the unwillingness and shifts of the Jesuits at Paris to disown him in this, and to disclaim that doctrine fairly and above board, shews that it is not yet quite extinguished in France, but kept in the embers, as in the reign of Henry IV. For all who understand that order of the Jesuits, know full well that none of them dare print, especially upon such a subject, without the approbation of their superiors. However, it is plain by this, that the deposing doctrine is still countenanced at Rome ; and that France is not entirely free from the infection. And though the vigor of Louis XIV. has depressed it very much, we cannot say it is totally extinguished, or that there is no danger of a relapse, while the authority of the Pope is so revered as head of the Catholic Church, and this council of Lateran is still owned as truly general and infallible. And the bishops of France still take an oath of fidelity and obedience to the Pope.

Lord—But that oath is not inconsistent with their fidelity to their king.

Gentleman—Pray, my Lord, let me ask you, is not an oath to be taken in the known and declared sense of the imposer, for whose security it is taken ?

Lord—Yes, surely ; for otherwise all such oaths would be equivocal, and no security at all.

Gentleman—Then the question will be, what the Pope means by the regalia of St. Peter, and all the rights, prerogatives, &c. of the Apostolic chair, as he calls his own, to which these bishops are sworn, *contra omnem hominem*, against every man or power in the world. For it is the pope who imposes this oath, and it is taken for his security. And has he not sufficiently declared what

he means by it? Take it in the words of the "Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris," in the Appendix where they say, "That by this decree (of the Bulla in Cœna Domini) the Popes declare themselves sovereign monarchs of the world." And this is no more than is given them at their coronation, as you have it in the Roman pontifical, where the triple crown is put upon the Pope's head, with these words,* "Receive this diadem adorned with three crowns; and know yourself to be father of princes and kings, governor of the world, and vicar upon earth of our Saviour Jesus Christ." And must not this governor of the world have power to dethrone all petty kings and princes that are under him? Else how can he govern the world? And the Popes think that this, their sovereign power of deposing princes, is fully recognized to them in the foresaid canon of the council of Lateran. And no Pope has ever yet been brought to disown this power. So far from it that the Pope who, most of any other, asserted this Bulla in Cœna, and set it up on high, causing it to be affixed and published, not only at the doors of the churches at Rome, but in the field of Flora, that all might take notice, as you find at the end of the bull, in the appendix; and who practised his deposing power (the last in England) upon Queen Elizabeth, absolving her subjects from their allegiance, and commanding all the Catholics in England to pay her no more obedience, nor taxes, &c. I say this same Pope has been picked out to be canonized for a saint, in the year 1712, by the present Pope, with all the solemnity and requisites in the Church of Rome, for making a saint. And this present Pope, as well as his predecessors, does, every year, thunder out the excommunications of this Bulla in Cœna, by bell, book, and candle, which, like Dracansor, cuts down friends and foes; for there never was a Roman Catholic king, in England or in any other kingdom, either before the reformation or since, but is excommunicated by this bull, and by the twenty-fourth article, past the power even of the Pope to absolve him, unless he first abrogate and annul all the laws of his country, which are contrary to the tenor of this bull. And this never was yet done; and, I

* Accipe thyram tribus coronis ornatam. Et scias te esse patrem principum et regum, rectorem orbis, in terrâ vicarium Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi.

dare say, never will be done in any Popish country in Europe; and there is not, nor ever was, any Popish country in any other part of the world, unless you will except the late Spanish plantations in America. And not only the kings themselves, but all their parliaments, councillors, judges, officers, even to printers or publishers, or any whosoever that "either directly or indirectly, tacitly or expressly, violate, depress, or restrain, the ecclesiastical liberties or rights of the apostolic see and holy Church of Rome, howsoever and whensoever obtained, or to be obtained," are all here together excommunicated; as likewise all archbishops, bishops, and clergy, who shall do the same, and all who shall presume to attempt any opposition or contravention, to any thing contained in this bull, are left under the "displeasure of Almighty God, and of his blessed apostles, Peter and Paul," which is the concluding sanction of this bull. And here saints must be joined with God, lest his displeasure should not be sufficient. By all this it appears that there is hardly any Roman Catholic in the world, above the condition of a ploughman, who is not excommunicated by this bull. And here you see plainly the Pope assuming a temporal or civil power over all emperors, kings and princes, limiting them by Article 5, as to the raising taxes upon their own subjects, without his express license; and exempting all ecclesiastics from being any way taxed by them, Article 18. Or being under their power, even in civil or criminal causes, as by Article 19, though it were treason, murder, &c. for which noble principle Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, was canonized, for maintaining the liberties of holy church!

Now, my Lord, I leave it to yourself, whether, if you were a king, you would desire all the bishops of your kingdom to be under an oath of fidelity to another, who pretended an absolute and civil power over you, with authority to depose you, as he had done to several of your predecessors, and would by no means be brought to disclaim such his power; but, on the contrary, made a fresh claim of it every year, and of his being the sovereign monarch of the world? Nay, he puts in his claim for more, if more can be thought of, as it is worded in the "Bulla in Cœna," Article 24, "All the rights of the apostolic see, and holy Church of Rome, howsoever and whensoever obtained, or to be obtained"—howsoever obtained, that is,

you are not to inquire whether right or wrong. And, "whensoever," that is, you are not to go back to antiquity, or the institution, or look farther than the present possession, which with him gives right when it is for him. And "to be obtained," secures any new acquisitions he can make, and all his future pretences. This is like swearing *Et Cætera's*. And now I think the plenitude of his power is sufficiently guarded! And all this is included in the "regalia" of St. Peter, and the rights of the Roman Church, to which the bishops of France, as well as of other Popish Countries, are sworn, if they take that oath sincerely, that is, according to the known and declared sense of the imposer.

21. *Lord*—But I suppose this oath must have been taken away if that model of Church government had gone on, which was proposed by the parliament of Paris (and no doubt with the king's approbation) that a council of the bishops, &c. in France should be constituted by his majesty to dispose of vacant bishoprics, &c. and determine all ecclesiastical matters without any appeal or recourse to Rome.

Gentleman—And it had gone on, but for the success of that confederacy formed by Pope Innocent XI. against the king of France, to re-establish his supremacy there. In order to which he sent a Nuncio to our late King James to invite him to be head of that confederacy. But he who had learnt no other than French popery, absolutely refused, and opposed the encroachments of the Pope's supremacy; as appears plainly by his concurrence with Monsieur Barrillon, the French ambassador, then residing with him, to cause the "Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris" against the Pope's supremacy, hereunto annexed, to be translated into English, and printed at London, in the year 1688, which was his last of reigning here. And the Pope had this for his excuse, that he should not otherwise have carried on his confederacy, than by concerting the deposition of King James. Who would not have agreed to the first of the articles sworn at the Hague by the princes, allies, and confederates, in February, 1691, and printed here at that time, viz. "That no peace be made with Louis XIV. till he has made reparation to the holy see, for whatsoever he has acted against it; and till he annul and make void all those infamous proceedings

against the holy father, Innocent XI." These are the "Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris," hereunto annexed. And in the treaty of King William with Spain, bearing date Dec. 31, 1690, it is stipulated, article 4, "That all things in the ecclesiastics (in France) should be restored as in their former state."

Now if King James would not come in to these things, was there not sufficient reason for the Pope to exercise his deposing power against him, in the best manner that he could? And if he had such power from God, then King James had no injury to complain of as done to him, being deposed by his lawful superior.

Lord—You recal to my mind the astonishment we were in here at the cold reception, and even slights put upon the Earl of Castlemain, ambassador of King James, at Rome, while a Protestant doctor, no ways acceptable there upon his own account, and some others, were caressed in an extraordinary manner. But the event of things explains their conduct. And now we see the reason why Innocent XI. was then called here the Protestant Pope, because he took part against King James and helped on the revolution. And I have been told, that at that time the Pope did require of King James, his promise to use his endeavours to have the oath of supremacy taken away in England; and that his majesty did positively refuse it, which some of us wondered at here. But that another did promise it, and in this, was as good as his word, and has taken this stumbling-block out of the way.

Gentleman—King James's fate was very hard. He was abdicated in England because he was a Papist. And the Pope wrought his deposition because he was too much a Protestant. And such Protestants are the French reckoned at Rome, they are called there *Hæretici Tolerati*, "tolerated heretics." Nor would they be tolerated, if the Pope could help it, that is, if he durst imitate the example of his predecessor, the new saint, Pope Pius V. to depose the sovereign, absolve the subjects from their allegiance, and interdict the kingdom. But that experiment proved so fatal to the Pope in England, that it is not likely it will ever be tried again, either in France, or anywhere else. The thunder of the Vatican is spent, and become a *Brutum Fulmen*. The emperor keeps Commachio still, notwithstanding it is particularly named by the Latin name Comaclum, in the Bulla in Coena. The second arti-

cle damns all who appeal from the Pope to a future council. Yet have we seen it done in form by the King of France, and the parliament of Paris, and that very "Bull" named, and thrown off without any regard. And the whole Gallican church are under this excommunication in almost all the articles of it, by the four memorable propositions, here annexed, which were established in the general assembly of their bishops and clergy, in the year 1682; upon which the Pope refused his "Bull" to the bishops there, as is complained of in the "Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris," and was the ground of their quarrel with Pope Innocent XI. And the learned Du Pin wrote his treatise before mentioned, *de la Puissance Ecclesiastique*, &c. in defence of these propositions against all the objections of the Pope and Church of Rome.

Lord—You should have said the court of Rome.

Gentleman—I understand not the distinction. If you mean nothing by the Church of Rome but a general council, then there is no Church of Rome now in the world; but if there be a Church of Rome, where shall we look for it but at Rome? And what is it there but the Pope and his cardinals? And is not that it, which you call the court of Rome? Where then is the difference?

Lord—We own the Pope to be the first and the chief of the bishops, and as such keep communion with him, as it is said in the "Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris."

Gentleman—The precedence of bishops is not a matter of that consequence as to break the peace of the church for it, or which of them should be president in a council. If that were all the difference, the bishop of Rome should have it with all my heart, or any other bishop they should agree upon. And if this were all that is meant by the supremacy of the Pope, we should not trouble the world much about it. But he will not be content with any such thing. The supremacy he claims is no less than an absolute sovereignty over all the churches and kingdoms of the earth, their bishops and their kings. And this not by any ecclesiastical constitution, or grant of temporal princes, which might be conditional, limited, and revocable, and would infer their superiority to him; but by a divine and indefeasible right, as successor of St. Peter, and heir of all the promises made to him, unalterable, unlimitable, and unaccountable to any power upon earth.

Lord—Whatever he means by his supremacy, we mean no such thing, or other than that he is the first or chief of the bishops, and as such, think ourselves obliged to keep communion with him.

Gentleman—But when he means one thing by his supremacy, and you mean another, and he has sufficiently declared what he means by it, and requires your owning it, and swearing to it for his security; who deal most sincerely with him, we who not believing any such supremacy in him, will neither own it nor swear to it; or you, who not believing it more than we, in the sense you know he means it, yet own it in general terms, but in a quite contrary sense to what you know he means, and trusts to as his security? We disown it, and fight against it. You fight against it as much as we, yet seem to own it.

Lord—But though we differ from the Pope upon the point of his supremacy, yet we keep communion with him.

22. *Gentleman*—Is not excommunication putting a man out of communion?

Lord—Yes; for so is the word excommunicate, that is, to put out of communion.

Gentleman—Can a man be said then to be in the communion of a bishop who has excommunicated him?

Lord—No, I think not, else communication signifies nothing.

Gentleman—Then none can be truly said to be in communion with the Pope, who are excommunicated by him every year, in the Bulla in Coena. And that is all France, and you, my Lord, and all who are on your side of the question concerning the supremacy of the Pope; for that is the main, almost the only subject of that "Bull."

Lord—But all casuists do agree, that an excommunication does not bind, which is made *Clave Errante*, that is, where the judge passes sentence through misinformation, inadvertence, or of malice, self-designs, or other sinister motive. In these the judge has erred, and also where he has exceeded his authority, and extended it to things that are not subject to it. In these cases the sentence is unjust, and will not be ratified in heaven.

Gentleman—But who is judge whether the sentence be pronounced *Clave Errante*, or not? And how far the Pope's authority does extend? He has excommunicated

you, all of you, as if each one were particularly named, for so it is expressed in the Bull. On the other hand you despise this Bull, and say, with the Parliament of Paris, that he has hereby excommunicated himself! And so you have a head of the church who is excommunicated? And so of every Pope who gives his sanction to this Bull, that is, all the Popes in our time, and long before. And from whose communion is the Pope of Rome excommunicated? Is there any other communion but that of Rome? Is a person excommunicated no longer a member of the church? And can he then be the head of it? These are matters of no small importance, no less than whether we are members of the church, or cut off from it? You are cut off, says the Pope and Church of Rome. No, says France to them, you yourselves are cut off: And yet these two churches are the same! And is there no judge in this case? Is every man left to his own private judgment? How then have we been teased with that question, who shall be judge? This answers all objections with you; for begin at what point of Popery we will, and bring arguments never so convincing, we are always stopt with this question, who shall be the judge? And so you refer all to the authority of your church: But when you answer this as your own case, you will have answered it as to us too.

If the Pope is supreme head of the universal church, he must have power of excommunication over all in his own communion, that is, according to his scheme, over all Christians in the world. And to dispute the validity of his excommunication, is a total denial of his supremacy, and setting up another supreme above him. And who is that? Who is judge whether his excommunication is valid, or not? And by what authority does he judge? It must be by some authority superior to that of the Pope. And so he is supreme over the supreme.

But if the Pope's excommunication stands (without which his supremacy falls) we may say, "*who then can be saved?*" All the Christian kings and princes that are, or ever were in the world, even those of his own communion, particularly in England, as well before the reformation as since, are all together cursed and anathematized to the pit of hell, by the *Bulla in Cœna*; and with them all their bishops, divines, parliaments, judges, lawyers, clerks, printers and publishers, or any others who have

any manner of way been aiding, assisting, or consenting, though tacitly, to the contravention of their princes to any part of this *Bull*, that is, as I said before, almost every one above the condition of a ploughman, are hereby all damned, by all the authority the Pope has. Therefore have a care of giving him too much, for he will take all any body will give him. He accepted this from Bellarmin.* that “if the Pope should command the practice of vice and forbid virtue, the church were bound to believe vice to be good, and virtue to be wicked.” Nay, his own canon law saith,† that if the Pope were so wicked, as to carry with him innumerable people by troops as slaves to hell, to be with himself for ever tormented; yet no mortal man whatever must presume here to reprove his faults, because he is judge of all, and himself to be judged of none. So then they must keep their reproofs, and not endeavour to stop the career till they are with him in hell, for then I suppose his supremacy ceases! Behold the machine, of human invention, which God never thought of, nor ever once mentioned, of climbing to heaven by a sort of mechanism, upon a ladder of popes, cardinals, councils, &c. And though we see them leading us by troops into hell, we must give no obstruction, because it would break the machine of their being our infallible guides to heaven!

23. *Lord*—But after all, if you could find an infallible guide, whom you believed to be so, it would give you much ease, and be a comfort to you.

Gentleman—But I must have some reason to believe him to be such a guide: And I could not be more sure of it than of the truth of that reason upon which I did believe it; so that all recurs upon my own reason still: And if my reason misleads me in this, it is the most fatal delusion, because it stops all methods of recovery, when I have once given to another the dominion over my faith. But this the apostles disclaimed, for when they exhorted the churches, they said,‡ “Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy: For by faith ye stand,” that is, by your own faith. And|| “if we, or any angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you,

* De Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 5. † Decret. Part. 1. dist. 40. can.
6. *Si. Papa*, &c. ‡ 2 Cor. i. 24. || Gal. i. 8.

let him be accursed." Did not this make them judges, whether any new gospel or doctrine was preached unto them? And our Saviour bids them stick to their own judgment, and said unto them,* "Yea, and why even of your own selves judge ye not what is right?" And,† "if I do not the works of my father, believe me not." Was not this appealing to their judgment, whether he did the works of his father, or not? And as many as followed their own judgment, they believed on him? But they who were tyed up implicitly to the authority of the church, they rejected him; they said,‡ "have any of the rulers, or of the Pharisees believed on him? But this people who knoweth not the law are cursed."

Lord—If a man durst dispute the methods of providence, it would seem strange that God did not order it so, as that the church should have first known their Messiah, when he came, and have declared him to the people, and then they all would have believed on him.

Gentleman—The apostle says,|| "that the foolishness of God is wiser than men." And he gives the reason in the words following, why "God chose the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, that no flesh should glory in his presence, but he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." And he applieth this to the case we are upon, to the revelation of Jesus Christ when he came. For if he had been received upon the declaration and authority of the church, we had gloried in the church, whose authority would have been prior and superior to that of Christ himself, as being the ground upon which we believed him. But as the sun cannot be seen but by his own light, so God and Christ cannot otherwise be known; no adventitious or borrowed light can shew the original light whence all lesser lights are derived, which, like the moon and stars disappear at the presence of the sun: So the church disappeared at the presence of Christ, who was known by his own light only,§ "we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the father, full of grace and truth." Here was no going to the church to know which was he? Or if you had, she would have misled you: It would have been like going to the moon to ask where the sun was. The church is the moon, and the stars are the particular

* Luke xii. 57.

|| 1 Cor. i. 25.

† John x. 37.

‡ John vii. 48.

§ John i. 14.

bishops, and doctors, and other eminent men: But Christ is the son of righteousness, and he will not give his glory to another.

Lord—But few believed Christ when he came, or in all his life, for it is said, that he was to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness.”*

Gentleman—The stumbling-block to the Jews was their authority of the church against him, as I have showed; and the Greeks, that is, the Gentiles, could not till after the resurrection of Christ have any notion of the economy of our redemption by him. Nor was he preached unto them till after the vision of the sheet to St. Peter, Acts x. For the Gospel was to be preached to the Jews first, but when they rejected it, leaning upon the infallibility of their church, then it was sent to the Gentiles: who being free from that stumbling-block of the church, received it readily,† and now make up the whole body of the Christian church throughout the world.

And this teaches us another thing, that is, that an infallible guide, (supposing such a one) would not be an infallible assurance to us, unless we were infallible too; for besides our not knowing him, or mistaking another for him, (for there have been false Christs) we might misunderstand his doctrine, and turn it to quite contrary purposes from what he intended. This was the case in our Saviour's time; he was a guide truly infallible, and yet how few followed him, notwithstanding all his miracles and heavenly doctrine? Therefore while we are fallible ourselves, and liable to errors, and mistakes, in vain do we grope after an infallible assurance, otherwise than the evidence of things makes them plain to that reason which God has given us.

The angels of heaven fell; Adam fell from his innocence; and the seven bishops who were the seven stars in the right hand of Christ, and the seven golden candlesticks, the seven churches in the midst of which he walked, these are all fallen;‡ and what are we that we expect infallibility? What bishop, what church now is so infallibly seated as these beloved seven were? What church has a promise of being exempted from that general defection which is foretold will be before the second coming of Christ, when he shall not find faith upon the earth?

* 1 Cor. i. 23.

† Acts xiii. 46.

‡ Rev. i. 20.

Or may we not rather think, that the plea of infallibility (so many ways detected) which hides repentance from her eyes, and hinders her to return from any of her errors, which, by this means, continually flow without any ebbing on any side, I say, may we not think this always increasing corruption, the chief cause to bring on that universal defection in the latter times? Does it not seem to hasten apace, to be even at the doors, when we see no absurdity so great, no text of Scripture so full and express, to be too hard for this infallibility? Not the denying of all our outward senses at once, and owning that we neither see, hear, feel, taste, nor smell! Not the express institution of the Lord's supper in both kinds, to which the council of Constance claps a *non obstante*, and takes away the cup from the laity! Not the authority and strong reasoning of the Apostle, 1 Cor. xiv., against public prayer in an unknown tongue! All these are overruled by infallibility. And many more we have to instance in the particular doctrines in dispute with the Church of Rome. In all which, by virtue of her unlimited and infallible power of interpretation, she leaves no text of Scripture of any meaning, other than she thinks fit to put upon them, let the words be never so express. And this, indeed, is no other than taking the Scriptures wholly from us, while we must not read them with our own understanding. And the result of this is, that the whole foundation of our faith is in the Church of Rome, without Scripture or anything else, because the Scripture and everything else is put absolutely and implicitly in her power. And yet, no man alive knows what this Church of Rome is, or where to be found; I mean that Church of Rome to which the infallibility is annexed. For if you travel to Rome, you will see nothing there but what, by a modern distinction, you call the court of Rome. Where, then, is this infallible Church of Rome? Some place it in the Pope alone, as the only heir of St. Peter, and living judge of controversy, and therefore, above all councils, and the whole body of the church put together. Others like not this; and because some Popes have proved heretical, and have been censured and deposed for it; and others of them have proved most wicked and flagitious men, who, besides the viciousness of their own lives, have filled the world with blood, rebellions, and usurpations, in pursuance of the deposing power they have assumed over princes; for these and other rea-

sons, they would not have the infallibility trusted with the Pope, but lodged it in a general council, as superior to the Pope, with power to reform and even to depose him. A third party approve of neither of these ways, for as they think the Pope alone, without a council, not to be infallible, so neither the council without the Pope, who is the head of it, and without whom there cannot be a lawful council, as not a parliament without the king; these are for king and parliament, and place the supremacy and infallibility in neither Pope nor council apart, but only when both together and agreeing; but because this will defeat several of those councils called general, and split others, as when the Pope or his legates withdrew from the council (like a king leaving his parliament) then such was no longer a lawful council, but a schismatical conventicle, as was said of the councils of Constance and Basil, &c. and because there have been Popes against Popes and councils against councils; and that the requisites necessary to constitute a lawful council and consequently infallible, are some of them disputed, as the authority of summoning and convening the council, and presiding in it; and other requisites allowed by all to be necessary, are impossible to be known with any certainty, as, that all the fathers there met should use all diligence to examine and canvass to the bottom every point that comes before them, and that they should be under no terror or fear of any, nor biassed by party, hopes of preferment or gain, or any other corrupt passion, but doing all things out of true zeal to the glory of God, and good of the church; otherwise that there is no infallibility follows that council; and this being impossible for any to know but God alone, consequently the infallibility of all councils is rendered precarious, and no certainty at all in them; or rather it is certain, by the histories of all general councils, that these human passions, not consistent with infallibility, had an influence in all or most of them; so that we cannot be certain of the infallibility of any council, unless we are infallibly sure that none of these human passions had a mixture in it; this makes a fourth party in the Church of Rome, that is, of those who place the infallibility neither in Pope nor Council, jointly or severally, but in the church militant, as they speak, that is, the church diffusive, or all churches up and down the world. We must then travel and learn. Here is a wide mark, and we are plainly left at last to our own

private judgment, to collect and compare, to approve or reject what we find scattered in all the distant churches upon earth: and no man's life or capacity will be sufficient to make the inquiry, in any tolerable measure.

And now, my Lord, which of these four sorts of infallibility will you take? There are three to one against you, choose which you will; and all these are of the Church of Rome; and what difference is there betwixt having no guide, or one you cannot find?

Lord—If I cannot find him, I have him not; and that is all one as to have none.

Miserable man! if he has no infallible guide, and is fallible himself; and yet upon his going right depends either his eternal happiness or misery.

24. *Gentleman*—You may as well find fault with the creation. Shall the clay say to the potter, why hast thou made me thus? Who was guide to the angels that fell? Who was guide to Adam? Who was, or who is guide to all the earth—to the Heathens, to Mahometans, to Jews? These last stick to their church, as an infallible guide, and therefore are most obstinate, and the most inveterate enemies to Christianity. Who is guide to infants and to idiots? And shall we interrogate the Almighty what he will do with these, or why he created them? And, perhaps, the greatest part of mankind die before they come to the years of discretion: and when they are of age, how few are capable to judge, or have opportunity or capacity to examine the different pleas betwixt church and church, religion and religion? And do we not see the generality of the world take up their church and religion just according to their education? My Lord, if you and I had been born and bred in Turkey, we might have been Mahometans.

Lord—Is religion, then, nothing but a chance, according to the place we are born in, or where we receive our education?

Gentleman—No, my Lord; truth is truth, though all the world should depart from it. And there have been converts in all nations and religions. But none where men cannot be persuaded to overcome the prejudice of education, and examine impartially for themselves. But infallibility bars all examination, for that implies a doubt, and brings us to private judgment; and where then shall we wander? And yet you must apply to every man's private

judgment, when you would make him a convert to your church, why else do you argue or reason with him? Must he not then examine all the arguments and motives you give him for the infallibility of your church; and judge for himself whether they are well grounded, and will bear the test of reason? Or must every body have reason and examine but yourselves? Believe it then you are in the most dangerous condition of any. And you are the men who receive your religion by chance, just according to your education. Suppose another should return your own answer to you, and say, I will not examine, I am infallibly sure, and I will hear no more; what would you think of such a man? Every enthusiast will tell you the same. He will take his oath that he is infallible, and will hear no more than the deaf adder the charms of reason; but he will bid you silence your reason, for that is it which blinds you, though Solomon calls it the "lamp of God," which he hath planted in our heart, Prov. xx. 27. This is the "image of God" in which he created us, and will be our judge and witness in the last day, as it is given us for our guide here: but instead of trimming this lamp to make it burn clearly, we hear the general cry from your side, "put it out—put it out—we cannot deal with you till that lamp be extinguished, it thwarts us at every turn, and starts a hundred objections, that we cannot believe peaceably for it. But when it is quite taken away (if that were possible to be done) then you offer to show us a meteor of infallibility (about which yourselves are not agreed, nor know where to find it) which will keep us from ever doubting any more; as when a man's eyes are put out, he cannot see a dirty step or a precipice before him, and then he is in that state of security you propose.

Lord—You see how this guide of yours, this lamp of reason has misled the nations; for Heathens, Mahometans, &c. all plead reason.

Gentleman—And we have no other method with them than to reason on still with them, and shew them that reason is of our side; and vast multitudes of them have been thus converted, even all the Christian churches now in the world; for all of them are of the Gentiles: and for those who yet remain unconverted, or have not had the gospel sufficiently proposed to them, we must leave them to God who made them, and will require from no man more than he has given him, but will judge all people righteously. Of this I have spoke before.

25. But I observe that since this notion of infallibility came into the Church of Rome, it has rooted out all charity, and her religion has been chiefly employed in cursing and damning all the world but herself. Her canons are tagged with anathemas upon every occasion, and you hear little in them of who shall be saved, but every page is full of who must be damned. And the *Bulla in Cæna* pins the basket, and leaves very few to escape, even of the Roman communion itself.

It is a common argument with which your priests frighten women and children, viz. "you Protestants say it is possible for a Papist to be saved; but we Papists say, it is impossible for a Protestant to be saved; therefore it is safer being of our side." But this has turned to their confusion, for as there is nothing in it but a confident averring, it shews that they have no charity, which is greater even than faith itself, 1 Cor. xiii. 13. And therefore that they can be no Christian church; their want of charity being by this much plainer than our want of faith. Take Chillingworth's answer to this, chap. vii. of his works, p. 306. "You (says he to Knot the Jesuit) vainly pretend, that all Roman Catholics, not one excepted, profess that Protestantism unrepented destroys salvation. From which generality we may except two at least to my knowledge, and these are yourself, and *Franciscus de Sancta Clara*, who assures us, that ignorance and repentance may excuse a Protestant from damnation, though dying in his error. And this is all the charity, which by your own confession also, the most favourable Protestants allow to Papists"

Militiere was persuaded that King Charles I. was happy in heaven, because he preferred the Catholic faith before his crown, his liberty, his life. (Now it is known to all the world that King Charles I. lived and died in the communion of the Church of England, which he declared with his last breath upon the scaffold.) But Archbishop Bramhal gave him this answer: "That which you have confessed here concerning King Charles, will spoil your former demonstration, 'That the Protestants have neither church nor faith.' But you confess no more here than I have heard some of your famous Roman doctors at Paris acknowledge to be true in general; and no more than that which the Bishop of Chalcedon (a man that cannot be suspected of partiality on our side) hath affirmed and

published in two of his books to the world in print, that *Protestantibus credentibus*, &c. ‘Persons living in the communion of the Protestant Church, if they endeavour to learn the faith, and are not able to attain unto it; but hold implicitly in the preparation of their minds, and are ready to receive it when God shall be pleased to reveal it (which all good Protestants and all good Christians are,) they neither want church nor faith, nor salvation.’”

Lord—Militiere suppose that King Charles I. secretly and invisibly in the last moments of his life, was by God’s spirit united to the Roman Catholic church.

Gentleman—Then no Protestant, at least no Protestant king need despair—but to these divines let us add some royal testimonies. King James I. in his Premonition to Christian monarchs tells us, that his mother (Queen Mary) as she was ready to lay her head upon the block, sent him this message: “That although she was of another religion than that wherein he was brought up, yet she would not press him to change, except his conscience forced him to it; not doubting but if he led a good life, and were careful to do justice and govern well, he would be in a good case in his own religion.”

This was perfectly agreeable to the sentiments of his grandson the late King James II. who often spoke to those divines who had the instruction of both his daughters, to be diligent in making them religious and good Christians, in the way of the Church of England, without so much as hinting at any change of their principles towards the Church of Rome, as I have heard myself from two of them, Dr. Turner, late Lord Bishop of Ely, and Dr. Ken, late Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells. And neither before nor after his coming to the crown, would he suffer any attempt to be made upon them as to religion, of which there is an eminent witness now alive, who knows if I speak truth. And when a certain zealot pressed him to endeavour their reconciliation to the Church of Rome, and offered his service for the purpose, the king answered, “No, let them alone, they are so good they will be saved in any church.”

Lord—It is strange that he should be a Roman Catholic himself.

Gentleman—Not at all, for he might think that best for him, without thinking those in hazard, who were sincerely of the Church of England, and lived up to the rules of it.

Lord—He could not think it lawful to be present at your common prayers.

Gentleman—He did not think it unlawful, because he heard them at his coronation.

Lord—That was upon a particular occasion : but does any Roman Catholic think it lawful to hear them constantly or frequently ?

26. *Gentleman*—They did think so; for after the reformation the Roman Catholics of England came to our churches and to our common prayer, without any scruple. And this continued till about the tenth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when Pope Pius V. forbade it by his bull; so that he made the separation; and if he had not sufficient power to do it, or that there was not sufficient cause for it, then he made the schism too, and it lies wholly at his door. Now it is the undoubted right of every national church to reform, alter, and model their liturgy, as shall be most convenient, provided there be nothing put into it that is contrary to the faith, which is not so much as alleged against our public offices. They have a breviary at Milan, and in other places, different from that at Rome. And in England before the Reformation there were divers in several dioceses, as what was used in the church at Salisbury, of Hereford, of Bangor, of York, of Lincoln, &c. as is mentioned in the preface to our common prayer-book, concerning the service of the church, But these differences did not break communion, nor did the alteration made at the reformation, till the Pope by the plenitude of his supremacy, and to be revenged upon Queen Elizabeth, took upon him to break the communion. For which as there was no sufficient cause, our liturgy being all orthodox, even our enemies being judges; so on the other hand, the Pope's supremacy did not extend to break in upon the rights and liberties of any national church, as has been and is still maintained by the whole Gallican church, and others the most learned in the Church of Rome. And, my Lord, I know some Roman Catholics of figure and good sense in England, who merely upon this account have come over to our church, and thought themselves obliged to return to the communion of their national church, and to heal the breach made by that excess of the Pope's supremacy, which no sober man on this side the Alps will own. It is strange to own it in

fact, and yet deny it in words. Whoever own this bull of Pius V. for breaking communion in England, must also own the full extent of the *Bulla in Cæna*, which has his authority in a particular manner, as well as of all the Popes since. And it damns almost all the Papists, as well as all who are not Papists.

27. *Lord*—We desire not to be called Papists, we think it a word of contempt, as if we were only partizans for the Pope, and of that party or faction of Christians who would raise his power above the church and every thing else.

Gentleman—I am glad your lordship thinks so, and indeed the Church of France, (where you were bred) are not Papists in this sense. They are got free, in a good measure, from the servitude of the Pope; but they are still Roman Catholics.

Lord—We do not delight in that word neither, as if our Catholicism were tied only to Rome; we term ourselves Catholics in general, as members of the Catholic or universal church.

Gentleman—We call ourselves so too, and in the same sense, and pray every day for the Catholic church in our liturgy. Therefore we call not you Catholics, because it would not distinguish you from us: but Roman Catholics is calling a part the whole.

Lord—You know the meaning, not that the particular Church of Rome is all the churches in the world, but she is called Catholic, as being the head and principle of unity and communion to all other churches.

Gentleman—If this be the frame of this Catholic Church, it must have been so always.

Lord—Yes surely, for there was always a Catholic Church, that is, some particular church, so called, in the same sense as Rome is now.

Gentleman—Pray then, my Lord, tell me what particular church was so called, in this sense, before there was a Christian in Rome? And how came that church to lose it? And how was it transferred to Rome?

Every bishop, every church, and every member of it, may be called Catholic, and were so called, as being included in the general notion of the Catholic Church; but in the sense you have mentioned, as head and principle of unity to all churches, no bishop or church ever had it, till

taken up in the latter times by the bishop and Church of Rome.

28. *Lord*—But how came the Bishop of Rome to that great sway he has long obtained in the church?

Gentleman—It is very obvious, because Rome was the metropolis of the empire; and consequently her bishop must be more conspicuous than any other, have more respect paid him, and more applications made to him, especially after the emperors became Christian. And for the same reason, when the seat of the empire was translated to Constantinople, the bishop of that church took upon him, and aspired further to an universal supremacy, but was opposed by Gregory the Great, bishop of Rome. There was no other consideration then for the superiority of one bishop or church, but the secular dignity of the place; for which reason the Patriarch of Jerusalem (which was uncontestably the mother church of all) was postponed, and made the lowest of all the patriarchs. But for divine right, and Christ having named any one bishop or church as head and superior to all others, there is not a word. And it could not be Rome before Rome was Christian; and Christ never named her upon any occasion whatsoever, or gave the least hint towards her, or that possibly can be applied to her. Strange and unaccountable! If he meant to build the whole Christian faith upon her, and to make her the Catholic church, as including all other churches of Christians, and in all ages throughout the whole world!

But, my lord, fact (as I said before) is the surest way to give us a true light of things. And the frame or government of the church is a fact, which must be determined by histories and records, not criticising upon words that afford no certainty. Let us look therefore, into the frame of the church from the beginning. I hope I have made it plain from the history of the Acts of the Apostles, that there was none of them appointed as sovereign over the others, whatever words may be strained in favour of St. Peter; for if he was called a rock or foundation, so were all the others, they are called the twelve foundations* of the church; which is said to be built upon the foundation of the apostles, and prophets,† Jesus Christ himself

* Rev. xxi. 14.

† Eph. ii. 20.

being the chief corner stone. And not any particular prophet or apostle.* And if the keys of heaven were promised to Peter, this was fulfilled in giving them to him jointly with all the others, without any mark of superiority in him. As in the commission to "Teach all nations,"† it was equal to them all. And we find in fact that it was exercised by them all with equal authority.

And all the regimen of the church which the apostles appointed was that of bishops in their several districts, without any head or sovereign bishop over them all, as supreme judge of controversy: of which there is not the least tittle to be found in any of the histories or writings of those ages next after the apostles; though there were many controversies even in faith among them which an appeal to this judge had speedily ended; but no such thing appears, which could not have been missed had it been known. Metropolitans were early, that is, the bishop of the metropolis or chief city of a province, who did preside in the synods of that province; and had other ecclesiastical privileges granted him, by the common consent of the bishops of the province, for order sake, and greater harmony of discipline. But a patriarch with jurisdiction over several metropolitans or provinces was never heard of in the church till the Council of Chalcedon, four hundred and fifty years after Christ. And many provinces were not put under these patriarchs, but had exempt jurisdiction of their own as before, of which Britain was one; for the patriarchat of Rome extended only to Italy and the isles adjacent. But the first pretence to universal supremacy was set up by John, Bishop of Constantinople, after the seat of the empire was translated thither, against whom Gregory the Great wrote, and said that though his See of Rome had always the precedence of Constantinople, yet that none of his predecessors, the bishops of Rome, had ever assumed such an arrogant title,‡ which he calls a luciferian pride, and declares him who should take it, to be the forerunner of antichrist. And yet his next successor but one, that is Boniface III. did take it, being given him by Phocas, that traitor and usurper, who murdered his master Mauricius, the emperor and seized his throne, whom Boniface owned and abetted, and was made univer-

Matt. xvi. 19; John xx. 23. † Matt. xxviii. 19. ‡ Epist. l. ii. Ep. 32, 36, 38. l. vii. Ep. 30, 36, &c.

sal bishop for his reward, in the beginning of the seventh century. Thus the supremacy now claimed by Rome, was introduced and has been maintained *pro viribus* ever since. And under this Britain has been subdued, which never was under the patriarchat of Rome. So much has the government and unity of the church been altered from what it was in the apostle's time, or in the first ages of the church: and thus has Rome usurped the name of the Catholic Church, and placed all its unity in submission to her bishop! Here we see the degrees by which this encroachment crept on; the patriarchats began in the fifth, and the universal supremacy in the seventh century. And Britain which held it out against the patriarchat of Rome, was at last conquered by the more apparent usurpation of her universal supremacy, so obtained as I have told.

And yet I have heard some Britains say, that though they thought the church of Rome the most corrupt part of the Christian church, both as to doctrine and worship, and to be a cage full of unclean birds; yet that they must be of her, and enter into that cage, because she was the Catholic Church. This is like that desperate maxim in the canon law, I quoted before out of the Decretals, that "though the Pope should draw infinite numbers of people with him into hell, yet we must not find fault with him, nor reprove him," &c.

29. And I must observe also, here, that though France has thrown off the Pope's infallibility; and his deposing power over princes, and has limited his supremacy, that is indeed taken it wholly away; for no supremacy, (properly so called) can be limited, for then it ceases to be supreme. Yet France remains still in the dregs of the corruption of Rome, both as to doctrine and worship. The religion of the people there, is, the adoration of the host, and of the cross, invocation of saints, worship of images, praying souls out of purgatory, telling their beads, and going to confession.

30. *Lord*—I have heard yourself say, that confession is a good thing rightly used.

Gentleman—And so I say still, but not in that sense it is generally used with you, and is expressed in your catechism *ad parachos, de pœnitentiæ sacramento*, sect. 46, 47. That such a repentance as God will not accept, nor par-

don for it, is made sufficient by the sacrament of penance, and all our sins remitted by it; and that *paucissimi*, very few can be saved without it. They might have said, none, for they here require in repentance acceptable to God, a sense and sorrow for sin that shall be fully equal to the demerit; *ut cum scelerum magnitudine æquari conferrique possit*, which is impossible for mortal man; and therefore all must be damned without this sacrament of penance. And they say, it was necessary that God should institute this sacrament, as an easier way for men to get to heaven. *Quare necesse fuit ut clementissimus Dominus faciliore ratione communi hominum salutis consuleret.* An easy way indeed! Confess to a priest and get absolution, and this makes up the defects of your repentance and you are saved *ex opere operato*, by the work wrought the bare performance of this sacrament. And the Council of Trent, anathematizes all those who say that the very sacraments of the gospel do not confer grace in the same manner, by the bare performance. *Si quis dixerit per ipsa novæ legis Sacramenta ex opere Operato non conferri gratiam—Anathema sit.* Sess. 7, Can. 8. It is true that God did institute his sacraments as means of grace (for which we bless his name daily in our general thanksgiving,) but this turns them into charms, when the very sacraments themselves, *ipsa sacramenta*, confer the grace *ex opere operato*, by the bare performance of the work.

Let us exemplify this to ourselves by the like use made of the institutions of God under the law. The Jews had got this notion of the *Opus Operatum*, that the bare performance of the letter of the law, in their sacrifices, feasts, fasts, and other observances, was all that was required of them. Whence the voices of all the prophets were against these institutions; they call them iniquity, abomination, and hateful to God.* Nay, God denies that he did require them, or ever did institute them;† that is, as a dead carcase without a soul, and working like charms by the bare *Opus Operatum*. God did never institute such, nor does require them at our hands. And may we not say? no more under the gospel than the law. For the gospel introduced a more pure and spiritual worship, but the Council of Trent, by naming only the sacraments of the new law, applies the *Opus Operatum* to them also, if not chiefly.

* Isaiah i. 11—14.

† Jer. viii. 22.

What else is the meaning of tying men to the repetition of such a precise number of ave's, and pater's, and credo's, at such particular times, whether the mind goes along with them or not? For you will see people in the markets, buying and selling, or discoursing of common business, and dropping their beads all the while to keep count if they have rightly performed their task of the *Opus Operatum*.

But if prayers and sacraments, which are means of grace of God's own institution, may be thus abused, and rendered hateful to God, what shall we say of those means of grace which are of man's mere invention? None can appoint the means but he who has the bestowing of the end to be obtained by those means; as if I have a thousand pounds to bestow, I may put what conditions I think fit, and appoint the means for the obtaining it; and none else can appoint the means. Now grace is the gift of the Holy Ghost, and none can appoint the means of maintaining it, but who has the bestowing of the Holy Ghost; which it is the highest blasphemy for any creature to assume to himself; hence Christ's sending the Holy Ghost is a sure proof of his divinity; but the Church of Rome takes upon her to appoint means of grace, many and various; the whole Pontifical is made up of the forms of consecration of everything almost one can think of into means of grace, as bells, books, candles, water, salt, oil, ashes, palms, swords, banners, and vestments of divers sorts, even to children's clouts, besides crosses, pictures, images, *Agnus Dei's*, &c. By the use of which, in the manner prescribed, several graces, both ghostly and bodily, are said to be obtained; as, besides the favour of God, and the remission of sins, the saving from fire, from diseases, from storms at sea, thunder, lightning, and tempests at land, at which time they ring their consecrated bells to allay the winds, and chase away the demons of the air, who seeing the sign of the cross upon such bells, and hearing their sound, shall be frighted and fly away, as it is expressed in the form of consecration of bells in the pontifical. Nay, there is nothing in the world so insignificant, (as a rose, or a feather,) which the Pope may not consecrate into a means of grace, and is in use every day. And at Rome they are counted Atheists who have not faith in these things. So much they place their religion in them.

Lord—The Dissenters object all this to you, as to your rites, ceremonies, habits, &c.

Gentleman—But without any ground, for we consecrate none of these things, nor do we attribute any virtue, ghostly or bodily, to the use of them, as to the wearing a surplice, hearing a bell or an organ, &c. they are purely for decency and order, and we may change them, or take them quite away every day, as our governors think fit. Can they shew any outward action or thing appointed in our church, by the use of which evil spirits may be chased away, women helped in labour, or storms at sea quelled? All which, and many more virtues are attributed in your church to the use of what you call holy water, and many other such institutions of mechanical means of grace.

31. But that which makes up the bulk of the Romish devotions is, the worship and invocation of saints and angels, the adoration of their images, and of the relics of saints departed, pieces of their bodies, or of their vestments, &c. to which great miracles are attributed, and therefore, they are made, strictly and properly, means of grace.

Lord—We desire the prayers of one another on earth, why not much rather of the saints and angels in heaven?

Gentleman—Because the one is commanded, the other not—nay forbidden, as I will shew you.

Lord—It seems to be giving greater glory to God, and more humility in us, not to approach his presence directly and immediately ourselves, as we do not to an earthly king, but by the introduction and recommendation of some eminent courtier, whom we know to be in his favour.

Gentleman—Your simile will halt on all four, for God is nearer to us than any saint or angel; in God we live, and move, and have our being; but the angels and saints departed are at a distance from us, and we know not where to find them, or that they hear our prayers, for they are not everywhere; that is an attribute of God alone.

Lord—Therefore our schoolmen say, they see our prayers in *Speculo Trinitatis*, in the looking-glass of God,

Gentleman—Do they see everything in that looking-glass? Then they know as much as God: But if not, then how do we know they see our prayers there? And how will this sort with your simile of an earthly king, that

the courtier must go to the king, to know what I desired the courtier to ask of him?

Abraham is the father of us all.* And he was called the friend of God;† therefore it is likely that he saw as far into that looking-glass as another. Yet it is said, that Abraham is ignorant of us.‡ And are not we as ignorant of their state, and what knowledge they have of us below? We are told that they have no knowledge of it. "His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them."§

Lord—It is said, that the angels of heaven rejoice over a sinner that repenteth.

Gentleman—That is, when it pleaseth God to let them know it, or that the sinner comes thither. But that they know of every penitent upon earth, is nowhere said, nor do I know it asserted by any.

But instead of the schoolmen's looking-glass and their vain philosophy, if we would look into the plain directions of holy Scripture, we should settle ourselves upon a much surer foundation. See then what the apostle says upon the very case in hand, "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility (or being a voluntary in humility, as our margin reads it) and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind; and not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God."|| And after says, "Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship and humility."¶ Here is a full answer to all your pretensions for this will-worship of saints and angels, for both go upon the same foot. It is called "intruding into things we have not seen," of which we are altogether uncertain, and therefore sinful in the practice by the apostle's rule, that "whatsoever is not of faith, is sin." This was spoke in respect of meats, but is much more so as to our worship and solemn devotions to God. Your comparison of access to an earthly king, is here called a fleshly or carnal thought, measuring God after the manner of men. And the result of this is no less than losing our reward, that is, heaven; for it is forsaking the head which is Christ, whose mem-

* Rom. iv. 16. † James ii. 24. ‡ Isa. lxiii. 16. § Job xiv. 21.
 || Col. ii. 18, 19. ¶ Ibid. v. 23.

bers we are, and receive nourishment from him ; not so from saints or angels. God has given Christ to us as the one mediator between God and men.* But we have made to ourselves many mediators to assist and help him, as if his mediation and intercession were not sufficient. And we make more applications to them than to him, or to God himself. You have ten *Ave Maria's*, for one *Pater Noster*.

And you have multiplied these saints to yourselves without number, like the heathen deities, and new canonizations are going on every day. Every country, city, parish, and almost person have a particular saint for their patron. You have saints, as they had gods, for the sea, for the air, fire, &c. for peace, for war, for learning, and all sorts of trades and occupations. St. Christopher and St. Clement are for the sea, especially the Virgin Mary, to whom the seamen sing *Ave Maria Stella*. St. Agatha is for the fire, and they make letters on her day to quench fire with. St. Nicholas and St. Gregory are for scholars ; St. Luke for painters, &c. And they have saints for all diseases, St. Cornelius cures the falling-sickness, St. Roche the pox, St. Apollonia the tooth-ache, &c. And they have particular saints for all beasts and cattle ; St. Loy presides over the horses, and St. Anthony over the swine, &c. And they bring their cattle to be blessed by these saints on their particular days. And they pray to these saints jointly with God : a scholar says, God and St. Nicholas be my speed ; and when one sneezes, God help and St. John ; and to a horse if he stumbles, "God and St. Loy save thee," &c. And upon every surprise they cry, *Jesu Maria*.

32. *Lord*—You should not compare these to the demons of the heathens, for they were evil spirits, and they called them gods.

Gentleman—The word gods is frequently given in Scripture, to angels and to men as ministers of God ; and thus the heathens understood it, and supposed their gods to be such ministers ; as *Æolus* to govern the winds, *Neptune* the sea, &c. Therefore they call them *Dii Mediorumi*, inferior gods, as standing in the middle betwixt the supreme God and us, to succour or punish us, according to his orders. St. Augustine, who knew them well, tells us

* 1 Tim. ii. 5.

what they argued for themselves; they said,* “We do not worship evil demons or spirits, but we worship those whom you (Christians) call angels, the powers of the great God, and the mysteries of the great God. But St. Augustine answered them, that they must be evil spirits whom they worshipped, because they required worship from men, as the devil did from our Saviour, which the good angels always refused, and he quotes Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 9, where the angel forbade John to worship him. And the same did the saints upon earth, as Peter refused it from Cornelius, and Paul and Barnabas from the men of Lystra,† &c.

Lord—But we suppose not that the heathens had any notion of the supreme and true God, but that they worshipped every one of their gods as supreme and independent.

Gentleman—Some men make monsters of others, to hide their own deformity! Your guides have set up this notion to hinder the parallel betwixt the heathen worship of their inferior gods and yours of saints and angels. For there is nothing more evident, than that the heathen did acknowledge the one supreme and true God, though in much ignorance and superstition. St. Paul said that they knew God, that he was manifest unto them, “even his eternal power and godhead. So that they were without excuse in their foolish imagination, to change the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man,”‡ &c. And he told the Athenians, “Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.”§ He did not preach a false god unto them, but they had blended the worship of God with these inferior gods or demons, which was their superstition, for so the word signifies, *Δεισιδαιμονία*, the fear of these demons, and it is thus rendered every where in the New Testament, which we translate superstition, and so your own vulgar Latin Acts xvii. 22, and xxv. 19. And the Latin word *superstitio* means the same thing, and is derived as Servius has it, from *super stare*, as being a fear of those heavenly powers, who *supra stant* stand over us, and so superstition is *superstantium rerum timor*. Others derive it from

* Non colimus mala dæmonia; angelos quos dicitis, ipsos et nos colimus virtutes Dei magni, et mysteria Dei magni. *Augustin Psal. xcvi.*

† Acts x. 26. xiv. 14, 15.

‡ Rom. i. 19—23.

§ Acts xvii. 23.

superstites, that these *divi ex hominibus facti*, "men deified after their death," are still *superstites*, and the fear of them as such is superstition: or *qui superstitem memoriam defunctorum colunt*, "who worship the memory of these dead men."

The worship of these lesser gods is what is forbidden in the first commandment, which respects the object of worship, that no religious worship is to be given to any but to the supreme God alone. The second commandment relates to the manner of worship, that is, by images. But this your church has hid from the people, and divided the tenth into two to keep up the number, that the people might think they still have the ten commandments; and it is thus in your very catechism *ad parochos*. But of this hereafter.

The heathens had their good and evil *dæmones*, as their good and evil *genii*; but according to St. Augustine's rule, they must be evil demons who accepted the worship of men, which were all the heathen demons. Therefore the word *dæmon* is taken in the worst sense, and translated devil, throughout the New Testament, and what we translate "the doctrines of devils,"* is the doctrine of the *dæmones*, or the worship of the *dæmones*, διδασκαλίαι δαιμονίων and a various lection has it νεκροῖς λατρεύοντες, "Who worship the dead." Then *dæmones* of the heathens were their dead heroes, whom they made *divi* by an *apotheosis*; as the Pope does saints by a canonization. But it is too gross to put it upon the heathen, that they thought every one of those gods whom they made, was the supreme God who made themselves. They owned these to be lesser gods and only the virtues and powers of the great God; and they thought that they honoured the supreme God the more, by doing honour to his substitutes; and all their worship was ultimately referred to him. So that† "he only was worshipped in all their gods and goddesses; for they made him king of all their gods and goddesses."

And the common appellation given to Jupiter, in Homer, is Πατήρ and Βασιλεὺς ἀνδρῶν τε Θεῶν τε, the father and king of the gods as well as of men. And he represents him as commanding all the other gods, sending them on his errands, calling them to account, and sometimes chastising

* 1 Tim. iv. 1. † Hi omnes Dii Deæque si tunus Jupiter. August. de Civit Dei l. iv. c. 11. Ipsum enim Deorum omnium Dearumque regem esse volunt. Ib. c. 9.

them. He was called *Majus Deus*, the great god. Lucian, in his Dialogues, brings in Neptune making suit to Mercury, that he might speak with Jupiter.

But besides all these, we have sufficient testimony in Scripture of the Heathens acknowledging the one supreme and true God; Nebuchadnezzar calls him "God of gods, and Lord of kings—the Most High God," and says, "I blessed the Most High, and I praised and honoured him that liveth for ever and ever, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom from generation to generation. And all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing; and he doth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and no man can stay his hand, or say unto him, what doest thou?"*

Cyrus calls him the "Lord God of heaven;"† and Darius the same, in as high expressions as any Christian could use, "the living God, and steadfast for ever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end," &c.

Lord—It is strange that when they acknowledged the great God so fully, they did not forsake their own little gods.

Gentleman—No, for they did not think it inconsistent to acknowledge one God above all, and yet, to suppose that every nation had its own god or gods, in subordination to the supreme God, and as deputies under him. This was their notion. And they supposed that Judea had its own tutelar gods, as well as other countries. Therefore the king of Assyria having conquered it, sent to teach his people who went thither, "the manner of the God of the land;"‡ to appease his wrath who had plagued them with lions. But, yet, they forsook not their own gods, for it is said, "they feared the Lord, and served their own gods." And they allowed the same liberty to the Jews, who were not required, in any of their captivities, to renounce their own God; but only to worship the gods of the nations where they lived. And of these tutelar gods, they supposed one might be stronger or more powerful than another, and therefore, they would boast of their gods, one country against another; thus said Sennacherib, "who are

* Dan. ii. 47; iii. 26, 29; iv. 34, 35. † Ezra i. 2; vi. 10, 12.
 Dan. vi. 26. ‡ 2 Kings xvii. 26, 27, 33.

they among all the gods of the countries, that hath delivered their country out of mine hand, that the Lord (the tutelar God of Judea) should deliver Jerusalem out of mine hand? Where are the gods of Hamath, and of Arpad, &c.?^{*} When Moses and Aaron told Pharaoh that the God of the Hebrews had met with them, he was not offended that they had another God besides those which were worshipped in Egypt; he took it as a thing granted, that every people had their own tutelar god.

This, then, was the difference betwixt the Jews and the Gentiles, the Gentiles thought it lawful to worship the tutelar god of any country, but still, in subordination to the Most High God, as has been shewed: on the other hand, the Jews were obliged to worship the Lord God, the supreme God, and him only, and they were forbid to worship any of the gods of the nations.

But this sin they often fell into; they worshipped these gods, but still, in conjunction with the Lord their God, as it is said, "they did worship, and swear by the Lord, and swear by Malcham."[†] But Samuel told them, "if ye return unto the Lord with all your hearts, then put away the strange gods, and Ashtaroth from among you, and serve him only. Then, they did put away Baalim and Ashtaroth, and served the Lord only."[‡]

Lord—But it is said, that they had forsaken the Lord.

Gentleman—It is called forsaking the Lord, when we will not obey his commandments, but worship him otherwise than he has required, and join others with him which he has forbidden; he said, "The house of Israel is estranged from me, separated from me through their idols; yet they come and inquire of a prophet concerning me."[§] And again, "When they had slain their children to their idols, then came they the same day into my sanctuary."^{||} And he says to them, "Will ye burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods, and come and stand before me in this house, which is called by my name?"[¶] It is said "they feared the Lord, and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations."^{**} But it follows immediately "they fear not the Lord, because they do not after his statutes, wherein he commanded them not to fear other gods." And again, "they feared the Lord, and served

* 2 Kings xviii. 34, 35. † Zeph. i. 5. ‡ 1 Sam. vii. 3, 4.
§ Ezek. xiv. 5, 7. || Ibid. xxiii. 39. ¶ Jer. vii. 9. ** 1 Kings
xvii. 33, 34, 41.

their graven images." Yet this was departing from the fear of the Lord, but not a downright denial of the supreme God, or throwing him off from being any more their God, and taking any other gods in his room as the supreme God. No, but it was taking other gods with him, of which he says, "Oh, do not this abominable thing that I hate."*

This was the first sin against which God took care to guard in the first commandment, "Thou shalt have none other gods before me, or with me.† And for the distinction that the worship of inferior gods or ministers of God is not here forbidden, we say, *Ubi Lex non distinguit, ibi non est distinguendum*, "where the law does not distinguish, we must not;" for there is no law but may be distinguished away. And this is exactly the same notion the Heathen had of their dæmones. And the worshipping of these or fearing them, is literally what we call superstition: it is a means of grace which God has not appointed.

Lord—But we have reason to suspect that several of the Heathen dæmones, or men deified after they were dead, were suppositious, and that no such men ever were in the world.

Gentleman—Many such will be found in the catalogue of your saints. What think you of the seven sleepers, who slept three hundred and sixty-two years, and thought it but one night? What think you of the eleven thousand English Virgins, all martyred together at Cologne; and the fine legend told of them? What do you believe of St. George's killing the dragon, and rescuing the king's daughter? As true as our ballad of the dragon of Wantly. Yet there are days kept for all these, and offices made for them, with prayers to them, and to God, that we may be saved by these their merits. There are multitudes of the like, which you will find even to a surfeit, in the devotions of the Roman Church, with their breviaries, missals, legends, and authors quoted at large. And can these prayers be in faith, to persons that never were in being, and for the merit of actions that were never done? This is a means of grace of our own invention indeed!

Besides, many have been canonized for notorious crimes, as our St. Thomas Becket of Canterbury, whose merit was, that he would exempt all ecclesiastics from the secular

* Jer. xliv. 4.

† Exod. xx. 3, 23.

power, though even in civil or criminal causes; which was called asserting the liberties of holy church, and it is fully asserted in the *Bulla in Cæna*. But notwithstanding all these authorities, it is a wicked principle, and dissolves all civil government; it exempts from the king's obedience, the first of the three estates of the realm, which has, or ought to have, the greatest influence upon the people; and transfers their allegiance to another sovereign, which is the highest treason, by the laws of all well governed nations, as well as by the laws of God. Yet for asserting this Becket was canonized; and for not giving way to it, the king was worshipped by the monks of Canterbury, to which he was forced to submit, in those times of papal supremacy.

Such another was your lately sainted Pope Pius V. the great asserter and last practiser of the power of the Pope to depose princes; and who broke the communion of the Church of England.

But there is one saint (truly so) of whom I have reserved to speak in the last place, because of the excesses of your church in their devotions to her, bordering even upon blasphemy to any common ear. No less than a canonized person St. Bonaventure, has published what he calls, The Psalter of the blessed Virgin Mary, wherein every one of the hundred and fifty psalms, as likewise the *Te Deum*, and other most solemn adorations of God, are all turned to the Virgin Mary. Rosaries and books of devotion to her are many; there is one translated into English for the use of the Roman Catholics here, intituled. The Devotion of Bondage, or the practice of perfectly consecrating ourselves to the service of the Blessed Virgin. *Permissu Superiorum*, 1632. It is licensed, and highly recommended both to clergy and people by the Bishop of St. Omers, with several indulgences granted to those who shall devoutly make use of it; wherein we offer up ourselves, both souls and bodies, as bondslaves to the blessed Virgin; among whose high prerogatives you will find this the sixth, p. 32, "The sovereign dominion that was given her, not only over the world, but over the creator of the world." This indeed might well ground that petition made to her *jure matris, impera filio*. "By the right of a mother command your son." And her being called, "The mother of the whole Trinity," in the Missal Polon. fol. 237. In the primer or office of the blessed Virgin Mary, printed in

English 1699, (and in the Exposition before it is said to be of "great antiquity, and composed by the church, directed by the Holy Ghost,") you will find many prayers to the Virgin Mary, not only of intercession or praying for us, but to grant us grace, pardon of sin, and eternal life, in as full and positive terms as could be asked of God himself. See the hymn, *Memento rerum Conditor*, p. 34. And *Ave Maris Stella*, p. 53. And the prayer to her p. 59, "Under thy aid"—*Sub tuum Præsidium*—which is taken out of the Roman Pontifical in the office of consecrating an image of the blessed Virgin, where we pray for aid, &c. from herself directly, without mentioning any intercession. Nay, they bless in her name, which was never done to any creature. The priesthood was ordained by God, to "bless in his name."* No apostle or angel ever blessed the people in his own name. But in this primer, p. 16, you will see the priest give the blessing in these words, "The Virgin Mary, with her precious Son, bless us." To which the people answer, amen. Here the principal part is given to the Virgin, her Son only blesses with her, and she is first named. But if she be not preferred, yet she is here put upon the level with her Son at least, and blesses the people jointly with him.

Lord—Why may not the Virgin Mary bless as well as any angel? And we find that Jacob prayed the angel might bless his grandsons.†

Gentleman—That angel was God, and so it is expressed, God, "before whom my fathers Abraham, and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." This angel was Christ, who often appeared before he took flesh. He was the angel which wrestled with this same Jacob, and blessed him. He was the angel appeared to Moses in the bush, and said, "I am the God of Abraham, &c. which no created angel could have said. It was he who appeared to Joshua as captain of the host of the Lord, and said, as before to Moses, "Loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy,"‡ which no mere angel ever said. So that this will be no precedent for blessing the people in the name of the Virgin Mary.

Epiphanius reckons the worship of the Virgin Mary,§

* Deut. x. 8. † Gen. xlviii. 16. ‡ Jos. v. 14, 15. § Her. 78, 79.

(not then so rank) among the heresies, under the name of the Collyridians, who offered cakes to the moon as Queen of Heaven, which is the same name they give now to the Virgin, and she is painted standing upon the moon, her representative.* Epiphanius observes that our blessed Lord foreseeing the superstition that would come into the world on account of his mother, treated her always at a distance, never once called her mother, no not upon the cross, or by any other appellation than that of woman, and checking her forwardness said unto her, †“ Woman, what have I to do with thee ?” She is as little named as possible in the gospels, where‡ Christ pronounces a greater blessing to those that hear his word, than to the womb that bare him. And she is not reckoned among those who saw him after his resurrection. She is but once named in the Acts of the apostles, and that upon no other account than that she with other women, continued in the communion of the apostles after the ascension of our Lord.§ But none of her acts or miracles are recorded, though abundance in the legends. And she is not once named, upon any account whatsoever, in any of the Epistles. Strange! that this should be so forgot, which makes now so great a part in the devotions of the Church of Rome!

But there is an honour of an extraordinary nature paid to her at the head of all the saints, in the office of the Mass, where, before the consecration, the elements are offered up to God in memory of the passion, resurrection ascension of Jesus Christ, and for the honour of the blessed Virgin Mary, &c. *in honorem beatæ Mariæ semper Virginis*. Did Christ then suffer, rise, and ascend for her honour? It was for the honour and glory of God indeed, but to trust her in or any of the saints to share in this, looks a little too familiar, and putting them, at least her, near upon the level with the Almighty, since more could not be said to him.

And here we may see a good reason why God would not have any religious worship paid to these, or any ministers of his kingdom, nor would be worshipped with them; for he saw there would be encroaching, and coming nearer to him than was fit for the condition of creatures. They would have a share with him. Nay that they might come at last to advance these above God himself, and

* Jer. vii. 18, xliv. 19. † John ii. 4. ‡ Luke xi. 28. § Acts i. 14.

prefer the saints even to Christ! As it has been said,* "that Christ did nothing which St. Francis did not do, yea, that he did more than Christ himself."

And now we see the reason why your *Index Expurgatorius*† would not have it seen in the Fathers, that "God only is to be worshipped," for they have expunged this out of the *Indices* of their works, that they might not be found by the people, who might take offence to see their worship divided betwixt God and creatures.

Was there ever so shameless a thing done by any church as to take upon them to correct and alter the Fathers? It is plainly to stifle the evidence against themselves; and renders everything at least suspected that they quote out of them. And the Scriptures had been purged too, but that they are so common in the hands of Protestants, that it could not be done without manifest detection. But how far they have gone towards it, by mistranslations, adding or leaving out some words, I have shewed already. But to pursue the subject we are now upon.

34. Not only the souls of the saints in heaven, but their dead bodies, or bits of them, a finger, a toe, or a tooth, or a scrap of their clothes, a girdle, or a book, or anything else that they used are worshipped, and great miracles said to be done by them.

Lord—Was not a dead man raised by touching the bones of Elisha.‡

Gentleman—Yes, God may work miracles by what means he pleases. But does this consecrate the dead body of every saint, to be a means of grace, and a worker of miracles? Many miracles were wrought by the rod of Moses; is every rod, therefore, a means of grace, either ghostly or bodily? Or may we consecrate any rod to be such a means? Nothing is such a means to us but what God has commanded and appointed to be done, as Baptism and the Lord's Supper. It is the institution, not an example, that makes anything a means of grace to us. Else we might go and imitate all the miraculous actions of Moses or of Christ, and call them means of grace to us, because so used by them.

* Lib. Conform. fol. 1149.

† *Adorari solius Dei est: Deleatur ex Ind. Operum Athanassii* Indice Lib. Prohib. et Expurg. p. 52. Madrit. An. 1627. item ex Ind. Op. S. August. ibid. p. 56.

‡ 2 Kings xiii. 21.

But as to the reliques in your church, many of them have been notoriously detected; and it has been found out, that the dead bodies of malefactors have been taken for the reliques of saints, and great miracles said to be done by them. The same relique of such a saint, the head or finger, is shewn in several places, and each contend that theirs is the right, and each have miracles avouched for them. Many instances of this, with vouchers undeniable, you will find in the devotions of the Roman Church. How then can you worship such reliques in faith? without which it is a sin!

35. But not only the saints and their reliques, but their images are with you made a distinct means of grace; for in the consecration of the image of a saint, it is said, that whoever shall worship such a saint, *coram hac imagine*, before this image, may obtain so and so, for which end the image is blessed and sanctified. So that it is not enough to worship the saint, but if I do it before such a consecrated image, I shall obtain more grace than otherwise. This makes the image itself a means of grace, for there is virtue there. Why else would it not do as well to pray, and not before such an image? Why else indeed are such images so formally consecrated, if there be no virtue in the consecration? And why do men go pilgrimages, or send vows to Loretto, or any other distant place, if they think there is no virtue in the image there, more than in forty of the same sort which they may have at home? And the saint represented by the image is as near them in the one place as in the other; there must be then some virtue communicated to one image more than to another.

Lord—Then you are against any pictures or images of the saints, or paying any honour to the holy men departed.

Gentleman—No, my Lord, we are not so stingy; we scruple not pictures for ornament, but not for worship, or for worshipping before them, as you speak. And we honour the saints departed, as far as we think lawful, and, as we are verily persuaded, as far as they desire; since, according to St. Augustin's rule before-mentioned, if they accepted our adoration, it would prove them to be evil spirits. And then you are to consider, that instead of intercessors, as you hope for by your worship of them, they will vindicate themselves, and become your accusers. But in our honour of them, we first take care not to

specify any particular person as a saint, but who is so recorded in holy Scripture ; for we understand not canonizations by men who know not the heart. In the next place, we limit the honour we pay them by the rule of God's commandments, which we suppose most pleasing to them. We keep particular holy-days for the Apostles, St. John Baptist, St. Stephen, &c. we bless God for them, commemorate their virtues, and pray that we may follow their good examples. We have one day for all the saints in general, and another for St. Michael and all angels. Thus we honour them, and for this we bear the reproach of our sour dissenters, as if we were too much inclining to Popery. You think we give too little honour to the saints, and they think we give too much ! But we hope we keep the mean. We abstain from the pictures or images of saints in our churches, because they have been abused to superstition, and to avoid offence. But in places not dedicated to worship, as in private houses, we think them not unlawful, more than the picture of any good man.

Epiphanius was very zealous against having them brought into churches, and tells John, Bishop of Jerusalem, in a letter translated by St. Jerome, that finding a linen cloth hung up on a church door, (it is likely to keep out the wind,) whereon was a picture of Christ, or of some saint, he tore it, and ordered a dead corpse to be buried in it. And he lamented the superstition he saw coming, by these pictures and images then beginning to creep into the church.

The abuse of things though otherwise lawful, which are not instituted by God for standing means of grace, as baptism, and the Lord's supper, may justly take away the use of them. Thus the brazen serpent was appointed by God as a means of grace for miraculous cures in the wilderness, and was preserved until the days of Hezekiah ;* but when they burned incense to it, it became an idol, was broke to pieces, and called by a contemptible name, *Nehustan*, that is, a bit of brass. How much more reason is there to remove the pictures and images of saints (which God never appointed) out of our churches, when we see incense burned to them, and they worshipped in your churches, as means of grace ? And yet there is no evil in the pictures themselves.

* 2 Kings xviii. 4.

36. But there is one picture I think has evil in it, and is unlawful any where ; and yet it is seen in your churches, and commonly over the altar, that is, the picture or image of God the Father, like an old man, &c. We are forbid to make it, and then we cannot worship it. See how positively God forbids it, "Take good heed unto yourselves, for ye saw no manner of similitude (that is of God) in the day that the Lord spake unto you ; lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female, &c."* And, again, "They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, &c."†

Lord—Both these texts are quoted and answered in our catechism *ad parochos*, upon the first commandment, and the answer is this,‡ that the sin here forbidden is to paint or carve *imaginem divinitatis*, "a picture or image of the divinity," or of the divine nature.

Gentleman—Pray, my lord, did you ever know a painter or statuary who attempted to draw a picture, or make an image of a thought, or of a soul ?

Lord—No, for they cannot be seen. Pictures and images are made for the eye. How then can a likeness or similitude be drawn of what is invisible ?

Gentleman—And is not the great God more invisible, and the divine nature much more incomprehensible even to our thoughts or imagination ? How then can it be represented to our eye ? I dare say there never was a man since Adam who would own any such thing, or ever had so foolish a thought. No, but when they drew any picture or similitude of God, it was only meant to express some of his attributes or perfections ; as by fire, his purity ; by a giant with many hands, his power ; with many eyes, his providence, &c. And so you own that by an old man you only mean to express his antiquity. And will not this excuse the heathen as well as you ? See the same excuse made by Maximus Tyrius, dissert. 38. "Whether statues were to be made for the Gods ?" But here you would put an impossible meaning upon the prohibition of God, to make it of no effect, and which will excuse the heathens as much as yourselves.

Lord—Our catechism and parochos (which is our text)

* Deut. iv. 15, &c. † Rom. i. 23. ‡ De cultu et Invocatione Sanctorum, Sect. xxxiv. xxxv.

in the place last quoted, sect. xxxiv. teaches us, that the heathen when they made images of serpents, beasts, &c. "they worshipped all these as God." *Hæc enim omnia tanquam Deum venerabantur.* And that the Israelites thought the same of the golden calf, for that they said, "these are the gods that brought thee out of Egypt," and therefore that they were idolaters, because they thus "changed their glory into the similitude of a calf that eateth grass."*

Gentleman—It is very absurd to say, that the heathen thought their images to be the things of which they were the images. That was impossible, for then they would not be the images, but the things themselves. Who ever said, that a man's picture was himself? Though they are called the persons, as when we look upon pictures we say, "this is such a man, or such a man:" but if any should put it upon us, that we meant the persons themselves, we must think them idiots, or school-men, that loved distinctions and wrangling. Maximius Tyrius, in the dissertation before quoted, tells us, that they had many images of the same God, as of Venus, Diana, &c. and yet that they did not think there was more than one Venus or one Diana. Have not you multitudes of the pictures and images of the Virgin Mary? And yet you say not that there is more than one such virgin. Now, the heathen worshipped their images, and if you believe your own catechism, you must think that they took every one for God, for *hæc omnia*, they worshipped all these as God!

And it is as absurd to think that they took that serpent or beast whose image they made, to be God. Or if they meant not any particular serpent or ox (for example) by the image, they must think every ox or serpent to be God. But they were not so ridiculous, as Maximus Tyrius, and all, as many of them as have wrote, will satisfy you. But that they made use of their images only as symbols, which being dedicated to such a God, they thought that this God would afford his presence with his symbol, and by it secure to them his favour and protection. How near your consecration comes to their dedication of images, I leave to yourselves to judge. But you put such monstrous things upon the heathen, as they disown, detest, and abhor. And yet you must do it, that your case and theirs may not appear so very like.

But you must draw in the Jews too, else all this will stand you in no stead. And you have no mercy upon them; you suppose them full as ignorant as you have made the heathen. They must believe that the golden calf, on the same day they made it, to be the great God who made themselves and all the world, and to have brought them out of Egypt long before itself was made! But the Jews will not let this go with you more than the heathen. They were not quite so foolish. They had learned the use of images and symbols in Egypt; and it is plain they did here imitate it. They had seen Osiris worshipped in Egypt under the figure of an ox, from which they took their figure of the calf. And it was to secure God's presence among them, upon the supposed loss of Moses, by whom they had received their law from God, and directions from him upon all occasions. But Moses had been absent from them forty days, and took neither meat nor drink with him, so that they thought he had been quite gone or dead, and that they should never see him more. And then how should they do to secure the presence of God among them? And they took to this way of an image or symbol of God, not that they forsook God, but to take care that he might not forsake them. And they meant his worship in that of the golden calf: therefore they proclaimed the dedication of it, "a feast unto the Lord."* And that it was wholly for the want of Moses they did it, (by whom they had found, by long experience, the presence of God secured among them,) they themselves gave the reason; "Up (said they) make us gods which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him."†

Pray, my lord, let me ask you, suppose it were made treason to draw a picture of the king, or to bow to it, would you venture your life upon all these distinctions and excuses which are made for the pictures of God? Yet we venture our souls upon it, if it be a sin; and though we think it may be beneficial to us, as putting us in mind of him, or paying respect unto him.

Now by this let us learn how dangerous a thing it is to make means of grace of our own invention, and to think that by our consecrations or dedications, without warrant

* Exod. xxii. 5.

† Ibid. verse 1.

of God's word, we can secure his presence with us, and procure the grace of health or any benefit either to body or soul. This is turning religion into superstition.

37. But the strangest instance of this that ever was in the world is that of transubstantiation, a mere school-nicety which no man alive understands, and yet transformed into an article of faith by the Council of Trent.

Christ said, "this is my body," but as to the manner or means how it was so, he said not a word, whether only sacramentally, figuratively, or symbolically. Or on the other hand, whether substantially, consubstantially, or transubstantially. These are inventions of our own, from our poor philosophy! And yet about these is our whole dispute; which has tormented the Christian church in our later age more than all the other mysteries of religion. Had we kept to the words of institution as Christ left them, and gone no farther, there might have been various opinions in the schools concerning the manner of the presence of Christ in the sacrament; and they who had nothing else to do might have spent their idle hours and vain distinctions about it. But it had never broke the communion of the church, if it had not been adopted into an article of faith, and made a condition of communion; and now we must dispute it. And the first thing I have to say is, that it seems very strange there should be any dispute about it. For our Saviour was then fulfilling a type of himself, which was the passover, and he kept to the same phrase or form of words which was customary with the Jews in their celebration of it, only putting himself in the room of his type, as instead of "this is the paschal lamb which was slain for us in Egypt," he said, "this is my body which is given for you." And when Moses sprinkled the blood, it was with this form of words, "this is the blood of the Testament which God hath enjoined unto you."* Instead of which Old Testament, Christ said, "this is my blood of the New Testament."† In which words there is no difficulty at all, for no mortal ever understood these words of Moses in a transubstantial sense, and why should they the same words when Christ spoke them, following the very form of the words of Moses? This made it familiar and easy to the apostles, who called

* Heb. ix. 20.

† Matt. xxvi. 28.

many things hard sayings which were not so difficult as this, and yet expressed no wonder or astonishment at these words of Christ, which had been impossible for them, not to have done, if they had taken them in the sense of transubstantiation, for it was a new thing never before heard or thought of in the world! To deny all their senses at once!

Lord—I wonder you should stand so much upon this; you object your senses and your reason, and yet you must give them both up in the mystery of the Trinity, Incarnation, &c.

Gentleman—No, my Lord, I must give neither of them up, for I cannot believe any revelation but by my reason, upon the evidence that appears for it: and my reason tells me that there must be many things in the infinite nature which I cannot comprehend, and therefore I acquiesce in the revelation, being once fully satisfied of it. This I have discoursed already. But for the other point, that of contradicting my outward senses, I think it an invincible objection.

Lord—Why, must you not give them up too, as to the Trinity and Incarnation?

Gentleman—Not at all, my Lord, they contradict none of my senses. Pray tell me which of them do they contradict? Is it the sense of seeing, hearing, or smelling?

Lord—They are not objects of sense.

Gentleman—Therefore they contradict them not. But in transubstantiation they are every one contradicted. And I stand upon it, that since the creation of the world, God never did, or said any thing which contradicted the sense of any man. It would be destroying the certainty of every thing. Miracles are appeals to our senses, and without believing our senses, we can trust to no miracle, and consequently to no revelation.

Lord—I mean not a general disbelief of our senses in every thing; but if a revelation (which you are satisfied is true) should bid you disbelieve your senses, in such a particular only—

Gentleman—It is a needless supposition; for there is no such revelation. But if there were, if an angel should appear to me, and bid me believe that I saw him, but not to believe any thing else that I saw of a hundred things I saw round about him, I should, without more ado, either believe that I saw the other things I did see, or if I must

not believe I saw them, I should not believe I saw him. And I take it as a certain rule, that we must either believe our senses in every thing or in nothing. Had not the Apostles at the Lord's Supper as much reason to doubt whether it was Christ they saw, and that he spoke to them, as that it was bread which they saw and eat? If you come once to *deceptio Visûs*, it will go quite through, and you cannot be sure of one thing more than of another; because the fault is in the eye, not in the objects: so that if transubstantiation be true, there is nothing else in the world true but it!

And it is no small prejudice to this miracle of miracles, and contradiction to itself and to all other miracles, and to every thing else in the world, that it should be put upon us just for——nothing——but to stagger our faith, and make us doubt of every thing!

For, if all the benefits of the death of Christ be conveyed to us in this sacrament, by a figurative and symbolical representation of his body and blood, and that it be so instituted, for this end, it is to all intents and purposes as beneficial to us, as if we had eat the flesh of Christ off his bones, or drank the very blood that came out of his side; which is abhorrent to think, and to avoid which you call this an unbloody sacrifice. But how is it unbloody, if it be real blood, even the self-same blood which was shed upon the cross? Yet you yourselves allow, that this must be taken in a spiritual, not a carnal sense, because Christ himself said, speaking of this sacrament (as your own) and to solve that hard saying at which many were offended, of giving them his flesh to eat, he made it easy to them by this explanation, "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you they are spirit, and they are life."* May we not then take his words in a spiritual sense?

Lord—But you would have the words of institution taken figuratively, as when Christ said, "I am a vine, I am a door," &c.

Gentleman—There is not one man in your communion but must own that the words of institution are figurative; for example, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you."† Here is first the cup for the wine, by a metonymy, called *continens pro contento*.

* John vi. 63.

† Luke xxii. 20.

Then the cup being the New Testament, I suppose you will allow is another figure. And it is another, to say which is shed, for which shall be shed, for his blood was not then shed. This last figure you have boldly avoided in your mass, where it is put *effundetur*, shall be shed, instead of *effunditur*, or *effusum*, according to the Greek ἐκχυνόμενον. However the two former figures stand unalterable.

But to show that the words were figurative, and that the elements did not lose their nature by the consecration, they are called by their own names after the consecration, as the wine is called the* “fruit of the vine,” after the consecration. And it is called “bread” which they eat in the sacrament. And we are called “bread” because we partake of that bread. We are bread by the same figure that bread is flesh.

Lord—We believe that there is no bread in the sacrament, but we are sure we are not bread.

Gentleman—You are no more sure of the one, than of the other. But see now the arbitrariness of your interpretation; when it is said of bread, this is flesh, that is so very plain it must be taken literally; but when it is said of the bread in the sacrament, this is bread, the expression is so obscure, that it must be taken figuratively. Is not this destroying the meaning of all expressions, to take words figuratively or literally, just as you think fit and contrary to the common usage as understood in all other things?

Lord—No, it is not as we think fit, but as the ancient church and fathers did understand it. Here we stick.

Gentleman—And to this we appeal. Tertullian says that Christ made the bread his body, by saying,† “This is my body,” that is, the figure of my body.

Origen says of it, that it goes into the belly, like other meat, and so into the draught, but says he speaks ‡ “concerning the typical and symbolical body of Christ in the sacrament.”

It was said of the body of Christ, § that it should no

* Matt. xxvi. 29; Mark xiv. 25; 1 Cor. xi. 26, 27, 28.

† Hoc est corpus meum, *id est*, figura corporis mei. *Contr. Marcion.* l. iv. c. xl.

‡ *Hæc quidem de typico symbolicoque corpore.* In Matt. c. xv.

§ Psal. xvi. 10; Acts ii. 27, 31.

see corruption; but we know the sacrament will corrupt, therefore it is not the same."

Theodoret likewise calls it the * symbols of the body and blood of Christ. And says, that † "upon their consecration they are changed indeed, and made other things, but still remain in their own proper nature, and substance, and shape, and form, and are visible and tangible, as they were before."

And writing against the Eutychians, who said that the human nature of Christ was absorbed or swallowed up in his divinity, so that there remained now none but the divine nature in him, and that he was no more a man; and used this comparison, that it was in like manner as in the sacrament, where the bread is changed into the body of Christ. ‡ "Yes," said Theodoret, "it is in the same manner, that is, in no manner at all; for that the bread, though changed in its use and significancy, yet lost not its nature, but remained truly and properly bread as before." But had he believed transubstantiation, this had been a full and absolute confirmation of the Eutychian heresy, instead of a confutation; for then there had remained no more of the human nature in Christ, than you believe the substance of the bread to remain in the sacrament. This explains the meaning of Theodoret, even beyond his words. And he says in the same place, "That our blessed Saviour, who called himself the living bread and wine, hath also honoured the visible signs with the title and appellation of his body and blood, not changing their nature, but adding to nature grace."

Pope Gelasius says, § "That the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, which we take, is a divine thing, by which we are made partakers of the divine nature: and yet it ceases not to be the substance and nature of bread and wine: and certainly, says he, the image and similitude of the body and blood is celebrated in the mysteries."

And Facundus says the same—|| Not, says he, that the

* Τὰ σύμβολα τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Δεσποτικοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἵματος.—DIAL. 2.

† Μενεῖ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας φύσεως, οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ εἶδους, καὶ ὁρατὰ ἐστὶ, καὶ ἄπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. Ibid.

‡ See his Dialogue called *The Immoveable*.

§ *Et tamen non desinit esse substantia vel Natura Panis et Vini: Et certè Imago et Similitudo Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Actione Mysteriorum celebrantur.* Gelas. contr. Nestorium et Eutychetem.

|| Non quòd propriè corpus ejus sit Panis, et Poculum Sanguis;

bread is properly the body, or the cup his blood ; but that they contain the mystery of his body and blood.

And St. Augustin says, * If sacraments did not bear some similitude to the things of which they are the sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all : but from this similitude they often take the name of the things themselves.—As, says he, the sacrament of faith, which is baptism, is called faith.

And St. Chrysostom speaking of the vessels in which the sacrament was put ; † in which, says he, there is not the true body of Christ, but the mystery of his body is contained in them.

But, my Lord, not to trouble you with more quotations, I refer you to Bishop Cosin's History of Transubstantiation, where, beginning at the institution, he sets down in every century the words of the fathers upon this point. A little book, long printed in English and Latin, not yet answered, (that I hear,) and I believe unanswerable, wherein you will see a cloud of witnesses, through the first ages of the church, and so downwards, in perfect contradiction to this new article of your faith.

And as the Scriptures, primitive church, and fathers, are all against you, so have you nothing in the world on your side but an unintelligible jargon of metaphysics, upon which the schoolmen ring changes, till the noise of their bells have deafened common sense and reason. Such are their subtilties upon substance, accidents, subsistence, moduses, and modalities, and many more such quiddities ; and their distinctions of *materialiter* and *formaliter*, *per se* et *per accidens*, and a thousand more, to solve all difficulties, and reconcile contradictions ! No absurdity can be named out of the reach of a distinction : and when we understand it not, it operates most effectually, because then we may suppose there is something in it ! Pray, my Lord, let me ask you, do you know the difference betwixt substance and accident ?

sed quòd Mysterium Corporis ejus, sanguinisq ; contineant, lib. ix. c. v.

* *Si Sacramenta*, &c. Ep. xxiii. And contr. *Faust. Manich* l. x. c. ii. *Sic Sacramentum Fidei quod Baptismus intelligitur, Fides est.*

† *In quibus non est verum Corpus Christi, sed Mysterium Corporis ejus continetur.* See St. Chrysost. opere imperf. in *Matth.* and *Epist. ad Cæsarium* in *Biblioth. P.* Colon. 1618.

Lord—Substance is that which *sub stat*, stands under or supports another thing ; so the substance stands by itself, and the accidents do adhere or stick in it. Therefore we say, that *essentia accidentis est inhærentia*, that inherence or in-sticking is the essence or very being of an accident, so that there cannot be an accident without it, for whatever sticks must have something to stick in.

Gentleman—When the substance then is gone, what becomes of the accidents ?

Lord—They are no more, for their essence is gone, which is inherence, and they cannot inhere or stick in nothing.

Gentleman—Now, to apply this ; when the substance of the bread and wine in the sacrament is gone, as you suppose, then their accidents are no more, for there cannot be accidents of nothing, nothing has no accidents : and they cannot be the accidents of bread when there is no bread : * and you will not endure they should be called the accidents of the body and blood of Christ : therefore they are the accidents of nothing, that is, they are accidents and no accidents ; they are accidents without the essence of accidents, which is inherence : there is roundness, and nothing round, whiteness and nothing white, a taste, and nothing tasted, liquidness and nothing liquid, &c. And if these accidents stand by themselves, why are they not substances ? For that is, the definition you give of substance. If you say they stand by miracle, then by miracle they are substances ; and there is an end of the jargon ! But who sees not that roundness without any thing round, and the like which you call accidents, are nothing at all in nature, but abstracted notions of our own heads, creatures of our own making, which, like *ens rationis*, have no existence but in our brains ? Yet we dispute about these, as if they were real things, which we come at last to fancy, by their being dinned so long in our ears at the schools ; and we fight for them, as *pro aris et focis* : we make them articles of our faith, and excommunicate for them !

Lord—Notwithstanding your ridiculing philosophy, you will not say that we can see the substance of any thing ; but that whatever comes under our outward senses, that

* *Catechis. ad Paroch. de Eucharist. Sacram.* Sect. xxv. xlv.

is, whatever can be seen, felt, heard, smelled, or tasted, are only the accidents of things.

Gentleman—And the same philosophy will tell me that neither can accidents be seen, felt, &c. For example, a round or white thing is a substance, but the roundness or the whiteness are the accidents. Now, I cannot see or feel roundness or whiteness; they are only conceptions in my mind, and come not under any of my outward senses; they are too thin to bear either my sight, smell, touch, or taste; nay, I will say that they are beyond my imagination too, for who can think of roundness or whiteness without something that is round or white? Therefore, if I see or feel any thing, it is the substance I see or feel, that is, something which is round or white. What colour, taste or smell, has insticking or inherence? For that is accident. Is it more like bread than a tulip? Thus easily may we dispute ourselves not only out of our senses, but out of our thoughts too: and the miracle of accidents without substance must not only work upon our senses, but give us new thoughts, new conceptions, which never before came into the head of mortal man! This is that philosophy and vain deceit or fallacy which the apostle says will spoil or hurt our faith. *Doting “about questions and strifes of words—perverse disputings—and oppositions of science falsely so called: which some professing, have erred concerning the faith.”

But if you are in earnest about this logic of substance and accident, will you lay a good wager upon it?

Lord—Hudibras says, “fools for arguments lay wagers.”

Gentleman—Yet you have laid all your honour and estate upon it—but are you so sure of it, that you would take your oath upon it?

Lord—These are foolish questions, and were never asked in any school dispute.

Gentleman—Nor ought to be, if you had let them stay there. But when you will bring them out of your schools into your creed, and make them articles of faith, you do as good as take your oath upon the truth and certainty of them; and you guard them with *Anathemas*. And it is impossible you can believe transubstantiation, or know any thing of it, unless you be perfectly skilled in the nature

* Col. ii. 8. Tim. vi. 4, 5, 20, 21.

and difference of substance and accident, and how far their powers do reach. You must distinguish between substantiation, consubstantiation, and transubstantiation, and determine whether the nature or accidents will best agree, sub, con, or trans.

Lord—I trouble not my head with any of these things, but I believe as the church believes, and there is an end of it.

Gentleman—Can you believe as the church believes, without knowing what she believes? This is believing nothing; it is implicit indeed! At this rate you need but one article of your creed to believe the holy Catholic church: and all the rest may go off implicitly, though you should know nothing of any other of the articles; and what a man knows nothing of he can give no reason for. But St. Peter bids us **“be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh as a reason of the hope, or faith, that is in us”*—which supposes our understanding it ourselves, and not in implicit faith in others, of we know not what.

So that if you make transubstantiation an article of your faith, you are obliged to understand it aright.

But there is something yet more terrible behind, for if there be no transubstantiation, then you worship bread and wine with *Latria*, by which you mean the supreme worship due to God alone.

Nay, though transubstantiation were granted, and fully understood, yet it is impossible for any man to know whether he worships plain bread and wine, or the body and blood of Christ? Because, in the rubric of the mass, *de defectibus circa missam*, there are several cases put wherein the consecration is void, and there is no sacrament made, and then there is nothing there but plain bread and wine; one of these cases is, if there be a greater mixture of any other grain than of wheat in the wafer; another is, if the wine be made of sour grapes, or grapes not ripe, *si vinum fit ex uvis acerbis, vil non maturis*; which is pretty hard for the people to know who never taste it, or the worshippers who see or taste neither, but only a *pyxis* or a cup they look into; and in both these cases, besides others, it is said, *non conficitur sacramentum*, there is no sacrament made. And so it is said if the in-

tention of the priest be wanting, which is impossible to know : upon which head they put a pleasant case ; as suppose a priest intends to consecrate ten wafers, (for example,) and after consecration, there be found eleven or more, then none of them are consecrated, because the intention going only to ten, it cannot be known which these ten are. But if there be nine or fewer, they are all consecrated, because the intention going to ten, it includes all within that number. Besides, you must take it wholly upon trust, whether there be any consecration at all ; because your priests do not consecrate before the people when they administer the sacrament, but at set times they consecrate numbers of wafers together, which they reserve for occasions, and for daily worship. Again it is said in some cases, *dubium est an conficiatur sacramentum*, that it is doubtful whether the sacrament is made or not. And what shall we do in this case ? Is it a doubt whether we worship God or a creature ? Or is it indifferent to which we give *latria* ?

Lord—If there should be a mistake in any of these matters, and we worship mere creatures, and not knowing it, for which we have been charged with idolatry, we have an answer ready, that this could amount to no more than material idolatry, but it could not be formally so, while our intention was right, and we meant our worship to God.

Gentleman—These school-distinctions are cobwebs, and will bear no weight ; for material idolatry is idolatry, else it were not material idolatry. And if our intention will solve it, it will solve it also as to the heathen, who directed their worship, and referred it ultimately to the true God, as has been shewn. But I hope you will not make Solomon so stupid as you have made the heathen, and to think that he believed Ashteroth the goddess of the Zidonians,* and Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites, and the other gods of the nations whom he worshipped, to be every one of them the one only supreme God ! Yet he is charged with idolatry, whether material or formal, is not the question, nor is there a word of it in the Scriptures, for idolatry is idolatry, let it be of what sort it will. And these distinctions are only to excuse it, and let it loose among us. God has forbidden it generally, of every kind and sort. The Arians were charged with idolatry for

* 1 Kings xi. 5.

worshipping Christ, supposing him but a creature: and they were so far from disowning the true God, that it was his honour they pretended in denying divinity to Christ. So of the Socinians, and our Unitarians among us, who give themselves that name for their supporting the unity of the godhead. Yet they are charged with idolatry for worshipping Christ as an inferior God. And they have the same distinction as you of *latria* and *dulia*, a higher and lower degree of worship: but all religious worship is forbidden to any but to God alone. These degrees of it are of human invention, to excuse our breach of the commands of God. But we are to keep far from the forbidden thing, not try how near we can come to it by distinctions of our own coining. We ought to "make a hedge about the law," as the phrase of the Jews was, to guard against any approaches towards the breach of it. Or, in the apostle's words, "to abstain from all appearance of evil."* And remember that we venture our souls upon these distinctions. Which, then, are in the safest way; we who follow the direct rule of God's commandments, as they are plainly laid down to us in holy scripture, without † "turning to the right hand or to the left, without either adding to them, or diminishing from them," as we are commanded: or you, who distinguish the plainest precepts, and make them speak metaphysics?"

By which the worship of the devil may be justified; for it is plain, that when he offered to our Saviour all the kingdoms of the world, he meant not that he was the supreme God and sovereign disposer of them, but only as having received this power from the sovereign disposer; for he said, "that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will, I give it."† And it is as plain by the answer our Saviour gave him: "thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve," that all sort of religious worship was forbidden to be given to any but to God only. And St. Augustine makes all to be devils who require or accept it: *latria* and *dulia*, signify both the same thing, that is, service; and here all religious service is reserved to God only. The distinction of the schools is vain, and meant only to elude the commands of God, and introduce all superstition.

There are other unworthy cases put in the rubrick of

* 1 Thess. v. 12.

† Deut. iv. 2, v. 32.

‡ Luke iv. 6, 8.

the mass, which flow from hence, as if a dog or a mouse should eat the sacrament. If the priest should vomit it up again, in which case he is to lick it up reverently, unless it be naucious, (that was well put in,) and then it is to be disposed of so and so. And again, if a fly should drop into the cup, how the fly was to be dealt with.—And one reason given for taking the cup from the laity was, that the laity (at that time I suppose) wore long beards and lest the blood of Christ should drop upon them, or stick to their whiskers! All these are the genuine effects of superstition, occasioned by the notion of transubstantiation.

And here, my Lord, let me observe, that the natural effect of superstition is atheism or deism. As one extreme runs into another, like east to west : for men of sense must find out the deceit that is in superstition, and then placing all religion on the same foot, as in your communion upon the authority of your church, they must think the whole to be a deceit, or in the modish word, priest-craft, and the contrivance of those who gain by it. Whence it is, that the holy scriptures and the legends have the same foundation in the Church of Rome, that is, her authority ; therefore, the common people believe them both alike, and the men of sense believe neither. And this does so lead towards the general defection foretold, that in a great measure it is it ; for it destroys the foundation of religion, and turns it all to superstition. And when the infidelity which that begets shall come to be publicly owned, then where shall faith be found upon the earth ? It is now acted in the *opus operatum*. And instead of the two sacraments which Christ has appointed as a means of grace, the whole face of your religion is covered with ten thousand of your own invention. The unlimited power taken in your church of consecrating every thing into a means of grace, your worship of saints, (many of them legendary,) their reliques and images, of crosses, and of the host, make up the bulk of your religion and devotions.

38. But not only the host or body of Christ, supposed to be corporally in the sacrament, but the cross of Christ, or any effigies of the cross ; and the images of Christ are worshipped in your church with the supreme divine adoration of *Latria*. As is told us by the great saint of your church, whom you call the angelical doctor, St. Thomas

* Par. 3. Qu. 2. Art. 4. in Cor. Conclusio.

Aquinas, who says that **“Cruz Christi est adoranda adoratione latræ.”* And again, *“Crucis effigies in aliquâ aliâ materia——latrâ adoranda est.”* And in the Roman Pontifical it is ordered, that in the procession of the Emperor and a legate of the Pope, the legate’s cross shall be carried on the right hand of the Emperor’s sword, because *latræ* is due to the cross.

And in the adoration of the cross upon Good Friday, (which is the principal part of the office for that day,) the cross being veiled, is discovered to the people by degrees; first one arm of the cross, then another, and at last the whole cross is unveiled: and at each time the priest says, *“ecce lignum crucis,”** behold the wood of the cross: and the people answer, *“adoremus,”* let us worship: and then the priests first, and afterwards the people, come upon their knees and pay their adoration to the cross; and remember that it is the adoration of *latræ* which they give to it.

Now for images—the same Aquinas before mentioned tells us, the worship we pay them is † *“religionis cultus,”* a religious worship, and that it is not a different *latræ* which is given to Christ and to his images, but says, ‡ *“That when worship is paid to the images of Christ, the latræ is not different, nor the virtue of religion.”*

If, then, there be but one *latræ*, and the same that is paid to Christ and to his images, it will justify what James Naclantus, bishop of Clugium, writes in his exposition of the epistle to the Romans, chap. 1. * That the faithful ought not to worship before an image, (as some, perhaps out of caution, speak,) but to worship the image itself, without any scruple at all, and with the same sort of worship as the prototype, or whom it represents; and if that is to be worshipped with *latræ*, so its image with *latræ*, if with *dulia*, or *hyperdulia*, so the image is to be worshipped with the same worship.

39. There is another strange *latræ* paid to the *præpu-*

* Quia debetur ei (Cruci) Latræ. † 2 da. 2 dæ. Quæ. 81. Art. 3, Resp. ad 3. ‡ Quod imaginibus Christi exhibetur cultus, non diversificatur ratio latræ, nec virtus religionis.

* Ergo non solum facendum est, fideles in ecclesiâ adorare coram imagine (ut nonnulla adcautelam forte loquuntur) sed et adorare imaginem, sine quo volueris scrupulo, quin et eo illam venereantur cultu, quo et prototypum ejus; propter quod si illud habet adorari latræ, et illa latræ, si *dulia*, vel *hyperdulia*, et illa pariter ejusmodi cultu adoranda est. VENETIIS.

tium of Christ, or the fore-skin which was cut off at his circumcision. Your doctors are at great pains to know what has become of it. They might as well ask what is become of the parings of his nails! Whither will superstition run? They had it at Antwerp, but the heretics took it away. From thence it travelled by many miracles to the church of St. John Lateran, at Rome, and how it was thence translated to the church of Cornelius and Cyprian, at Calcata, about twenty miles from Rome. I have read the account at large in a book in folio, entitled, "*De Basilicâ et Patriarchio Lateranensi, ad Alexand, VII. Pont. Max. auctore Cæsare Raspono, ejusdem Basilicæ Canonico. Romæ, 1656,*" p. 364, &c. And of the miraculous difference it shewed when it was touched by virgins and by married women! See the devotions of the Roman Church, p. 31, where you will find other authors quoted, as Bollandus, *Act. Sanct. ad Jan. l. de Præputio Christi*; and Rivet. *Apologia pro S. Maria Virgine*; Lib. 1, c. xvii. Cardinal Tolet, in cap. ii. Luc. Annot. 31, and Salmeron, in *Evang. Tom. 3, Tract. 36*. And that though it is still at Calcata, yet it is carried about at Podium with great veneration upon the feast of the ascension. Salmeron, in the place above quoted, tells us, out of the legend of *Jacobus de Voragine*, that the blessed Virgin gave this *præputium* first to Mary Magdalen, and that it was brought afterwards by an angel to Charles the great at Aken, and how after it came to be laid up in the Lateran. Whence these verses,

Circumcisa caro Christi, sandalia sacra,
Atque umbilici viget hic præcisio chara.

Put thus into English :

Christ's fore skin and blest sandals are kept here
And what was cut from off his navel dear.

I suppose they meant the cutting of his navel string. And his sandals (though it is not said that he wore any, he is always painted bare-foot) will come in here too for latria, for the same reason which T. Aquinas gives for latria as due to the cross, * "*propter membrorum Christi contactum,*" because it touched the body of Christ. Then all his clothes must come in for the same reason, and the nails and spear that pierced him. And why not the spittle that was thrown

* Par. 3, Qu. 2, Art. 4, in the conclusion.

in his face? For the cross was as much his enemy (as far as wood could be) as any of the other, or the spittle itself. And I know not why the crucifiers should not be admitted too, though they touched him with a hostile mind, as some have sainted Judas, because he was an instrument in our redemption. For there is no stop in superstition more than in other arts.

But I must not forget, my friends, the school-men upon this occasion; they dispute that the fore-skin being of the entireness of the body, it must have been reunited to the body of Christ upon his resurrection, else that the entire body did not arise. * Suarez, therefore concludes, that the body of Christ at the resurrection has a fore-skin, and has now in heaven. But what, then, will he do with that fore-skin, which is shewed in the church here below? He says that the fore-skin belongs to the entireness of the body, *non formaliter, sed materialiter*, not formally, but only materially; and so the business is made up! But he adds, that Innocent III. did call in question the truth of this fore-skin upon earth. Is it a question, then? And do the people still pay latria to it? How comes this to be suffered in the church?—In the church that is infallible!

But several parcels of the blood of Christ shed upon the cross are likewise shewed, and † Cressy quotes Matth. Paris, for a signal testimony of it.

To this says Aquinas, ‡ that “whatever belongs to the nature of an inhuman body was wholly in the body of Christ when he arose, as his flesh and bones, and his blood, and that entirely without any diminution, otherwise (says he) it had not been a perfect resurrection.” And afterwards, “that all the blood which flowed from the body of Christ, rose again in his body. But as for that blood (says he) which is preserved in some churches for reliques, it did not flow from Christ’s side, but is said to have flowed miraculously from a certain image of Christ that was pierced.” Yet the people pay latria to it, grounded wholly upon a legend! And Aquinas gives no farther assurance of it, than that it was said, “Is not this worshipping in faith? What blood was that which came out of the image? Was it Christ’s blood? And how was it made so? Was it transubstantiated? Or was it blood materially, though

* Suar. in 3, par. qu. 54, act 4, disp. 47. † Ch. hist. 1. 2, c. 13.

‡ Part. 3, qu. 34, artic. 2, *respondent dicendum*.

not formally? Or had it only the colour of blood, the accidents remaining without the substance?" Vasquez comes pretty near this, when he says, * "that no portion of the blood of Christ did remain on earth under the form of blood, but only under its colour, *amissâ formâ sanguinis*, having lost the form of blood."

Lord—What is this matter and form with which they keep such a stir?

Gentleman—They make three constituting principles in every thing; these they call *materia, forma, et privatio*. That is, the matter of which any thing is made; the form, which is wholly unknown to us; and the want of that form; for you must know that we must want a thing, before we have it!

Lord—Trouble me no more with this jargon: I pin not my faith upon school-men.

Gentleman—Yet this article of your faith, that is transubstantiation, is nothing else, as I have (I hope) made it plain. And I will shew you another instance wherein you follow them too, and are grossly misled by them, that is, the distinction of concomitancy.

Lord—What is that? I know it not.

40. *Gentleman*—I have before told of several injuries done to our Lord Christ, in adding to his commandments, and making to ourselves means of grace which he has not instituted. What I am to speak of now is an error on the other hand, that is of subtracting from his institutions, and the means of grace which he has appointed: I mean in taking away the cup from the laity in the holy sacrament. Christ instituted the sacrament of his body and blood as an effectual means of grace, calling it the "Communion of his body and blood;" particularly of the cup, it is said,† "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" And that we all partake of the cup, according to several manuscripts of your own vulgar Latin. *Omnes de uno pane, et de uno calice participamus*. But that the laity might not think themselves deprived of this so beneficial a means of the greatest grace, the schools have invented a distinction they call concomitancy, which is, that in all flesh there is some blood goes along, or is concomitant with it, so that whoever eat the flesh partake also of the blood.

* In 3. par. Thomæ, Qu. 5, Artic. 2, Disp. 36, c. 8. See also c. 4.

† 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.

Lord—And is not that true?

Gentleman—Really, my Lord, I know not. But I am sure it is a nicety: for flesh may be so dried that no blood shall appear in it, and in a wafer there can be none, without having recourse to miracle. I think it is making too bold, to throw off the institution of Christ, upon such imaginations of our own; which imply that there was no need of the institution of the cup, for if it be not necessary now, it was not so then. But, my lord, this sacrament was ordained, not only to express the death of Christ, but also the manner of it, that is, by the shedding of his blood, according to the bloody types of him under the law, as it is said, “without shedding of blood there is no remission.*” It was therefore necessary; says the apostle. But whatever blood may be concomitant in the flesh, yet here is no shedding of it expressed in the wafer.

Lord—But the cup always goes along with the bread in our church, to complete the sacrifice, though the priest only who officiates partakes of the cup.

But when the hostia is carried in procession, as upon Corpus Christi day, or frequently to the sick, there is no cup, nor does the priest himself communicate. But, however, if the people are to partake of the sacrifice, as it was under the law, here they are defrauded of half of it! And they are as much commanded to partake of the cup as of the bread. And the church may as well take away the bread, and leave only the cup, and say, that the flesh is contained in the blood, as well as the blood in the flesh. Strange power of church! What institution of God can stand at this rate? Suppose the Jews had neglected to pour out or sprinkle the blood of their sacrifices, as commanded, and said it was sufficient that it was by concomitancy in the flesh; would this distinction have served in that case? And why not as well in this?

It is observable that Christ, as foreseeing this taking away of the cup from many, added the word “all” to the drinking of the cup, “Drink ye all of it.”† And it is said, “they all drank of it;”‡ it is not said so of the bread.

Lord—There were none there but the apostles; so that this refers not to the laity.

Gentleman—So you may say of the bread, and take that too from the laity by the same rule, and you take the cup from the priests who do not officiate. But Christ said to

* Heb. ix. 22.

† Matt. xxvi. 27.

‡ Mark xiv. 23.

the people to the laity, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."* And this is understood by all you of the church of Rome, as spoken of the sacrament.

Lord—† Bellarmine says, that the "and" there, "and drink," is to be understood as an "or," that is, "except ye either eat or drink."

Gentleman—That is to say, I may understand all the "ands" in the creed to be "ors" and instead of I believe this, and this, and this, I may say I believe this, or this, or this, so that if I believe any one article, it is sufficient, though I believe never another. If you send your servant to market, and bid him bring beef and mutton and pork, and he buys only beef, and says, he understood all your "ands" for "ors." And so, if you bid him bring so much meat and so much drink, and he brings only the meat, for the same reason.—Thus we may easily get over all the commands of God, and give the reverse to St. James, "that he who offends in one point is guilty of all."‡ No, but he who keeps one point, keeps the whole law. This is bantering instead of arguing: and it shows a cause to be very destitute, when so great a man as Bellarmine could content himself with giving such an answer.

And the doctrine of concomitancy will not do here, for if I eat a piece of flesh, suppose some blood may be said to be concomitant there; yet I cannot be said to drink where there is not one drop: and the threatening is, "except ye drink there's no life in you."

If it be but a man's testament, (says St. Paul,) yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto.§ This holy sacrament was the last testament which Christ left to his church, instituted the evening before he entered upon his sacred passion. Therefore, Pope Gelasius had good reason to call it || "sacrilege in any who should mutilate this sacrament," and commanded that they who would not drink of the cup, should be denied the bread too, for other reasons than the Church of Rome had to take it from the laity.

Lord—This was only to discover the Manichæans who would not drink of the cup.

Gentleman—I never heard a tolerable reason for it, except because they were laity: but the dispute is not about the reasons for it, but the thing itself. To take away the

* John vi. 53. † De Sacram. Eucharist. l. 4. c. 25. ‡ James ii. 10. § Gal. iii. 15. || Apud Gratian. can. *Comperimus de Consecr. Dist. 2.*

cup is to mutilate the sacrament : and that is sacrilege by Gelasius his determination.

And this last testament of our Lord, which was confirmed by the practice of the church for fourteen hundred years, was mutilated by the * council of Constance, and the cup taken from the laity, with a *non obstante* as well to the institution of Christ, as the practice of the primitive church. It was declared no sacrilege, and the priest was excommunicated who should communicate the laity under both kinds.

The council of Trent † likewise puts in its caveat to the institution in both kinds, and that notwithstanding the laity must be excluded from the cup. And they make it a heresy to say, that whole Christ is not under each species. Then the flesh is as much in the blood, as the blood in the flesh : and it is all one which species we take. But since the body and blood of Christ were separated at his death, and he ordained them to be so separated in the sacrament of it, I see not how we can take away either part upon the account of their not being separated.

Lord—Our catechism *ad Parochos* gives six reasons for taking away the cup. ‡ First, the danger of spilling it. Secondly, of its turning sour. Thirdly and fourthly, for our health, because some could not bear the taste or smell of wine without being sick. Fifthly, that wine was very dear in some places. And the sixth, that we might believe whole Christ to be under each species. Gerson's reason about the long beards of the laity, before mentioned, comes under the first of these heads concerning spilling.

Gentleman—Now, my lord, I leave it to yourself, whether these reasons be not very childish, or are of weight to maim the institution of Christ ?

There must no comparison be made betwixt the body and blood of Christ, as to preference, or which is most valuable : but our redemption is oftener attributed in holy Scripture to his blood than to his body. We are saved by his blood, propitiation through his blood, by the sprinkling of his blood, &c.

Lord—There is mention made sometimes of the breaking of bread, when there is nothing said of the cup ; and

* *Licet Christus*—Administraverit sub utrâque specie Panis et Vini—tamen hoc non obstante—Et similiter quòd licet in primitivâ Ecclesiâ hujusmodi Sacramentum reciperetur á fidelibus sub utrâque specie ; tamen—Præcipimus sub pœnâ excommunicationis quòd nullus Presbyter communicet Populum sub utrâque specie Panis et Vini. Sess. 13.

† Sess. 21. Can. 1, 2, 3. ‡ De Eucharist, Sacrament, Sec. lxx.

this we make use of as an argument that the cup is not necessary. This is mainly insisted upon in our catechism, the chapter you just now named, sec. lxx. And John vi. 51, is quoted, "I am the living bread—if any man eat of this bread; and the bread I will give is my flesh."

Gentleman—We take not this to be spoke of the sacrament, but of faith in Christ, here expressed by eating, that is, spiritually, as himself explains it, v. 63. "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." But let it be taken of the sacrament as you do, you will find the blood joined with the flesh, in the next words, v. 53, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood," as before quoted. And again, v. 54, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood." And v. 55. "For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." And v. 56, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood." Is not the blood here named with the flesh? But if it were not, there are a hundred places, as I now observed where the blood of Christ is named as cleansing, or redeeming us, &c. without any mention of his flesh or body. Are they therefore excluded? This is such a sort of reasoning, as if I invite you to eat with me, you must have no drink to your dinner, because it was not named. But if by eating we commonly mean the whole meal, and drinking is likewise included, this criticism upon the Lord's Supper, of calling it eating, will appear what it is, and not be thought sufficient to exclude the cup in the sacrament. And other foundation you have none in Scripture. But if I once call it eating the Lord's Supper, and several times call it both eating and drinking, will not the latter explain the former? Or will eating exclude drinking, though drinking be expressly named? To eat the Lord's Supper is the only phrase we use, I never heard any body call it drinking the Supper; and you may thence prove that we have not the cup in our sacrament, as well as that the apostles had it not, because it is said they eat bread, or broke bread. But I have overlaboured this point, because you lay so much stress upon it.

I will now shew you another restriction your church has made upon the institutions of God. As she has taken the cup from the laity, so has she taken another of your sacraments, that is marriage, from the clergy. I pass by the politic views and advantages the court of Rome has in this, as giving the Pope the more absolute command, and mak-

ing him in effect heir of all the great possessions of the clergy, for the canon law obliges the regular bishops not to dispose of their estates by will,* and the other clergy not to be too liberal of their alms in their sickness. And what they leave, the Pope disposes of, as grand treasurer of the church. But waving all this, I will insist now only upon what relates to conscience. You reckon it a defilement in your church for a clergyman to marry. No great compliment to the married state, which yet was instituted by God in Paradise while man was in his innocence. And the apostle says, "marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled."† And "forbidding to marry"‡ is reckoned one of the "doctrines of devils." And directions are given how a bishop should govern his wife and children, "for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?"§ Yet your interpreters would have this wife and this house to be the church! St. Peter was a married man, and forsook not his wife after he was an apostle, but "led her about"|| with him as other apostles did. And that in the primitive church the clergy did marry is plain, from Socrates's Eccles. Hist. lib. i. cap. xi. and l. v. c. 22. The vow of single life was not imposed upon the clergy till Pope Hildebrand. See Matth. Westmon. A.D. 1074. Vincent Spec. Hist. l. xxi. c. 45. Antonin. l. xvi. c. i. ss. 21. And it was without precedent (says Sigebert Chron. A.D. 1074,) and, as many thought, out of an indiscreet zeal, contrary to the opinion of the holy fathers. But Hildebrand was not obeyed in this in England for above a hundred years after, for our ancient records say, "all those decrees availed nothing, for the priests by the King's consent still had their wives as formerly."¶ And Gregory the Great said, "That it was lawful for such of the clergy as could not contain to marry."** And Pius the second said the same, "That they may be allowed to marry."†† And your greatest canonist Panormitan says, "There is a great reason to allow priests to marry now, as ever there was to restrain it."‡‡ Let St. Bernard bear witness in his time

* Decretal Gregor. de lib. Testam. tit. 26. cap. 7, 9. † Heb. xiii. 4. ‡ 1 Tim. iv. 3. § 1 Tim. iii. 5. || 1 Cor. ix. 5.

¶ Histor. Petriburg. A. D. 1127, ap. Spelm. 36, T. 2, p. 36.

** Respons. ad. Interrog. Secund. Aug. Cantuar. †† Pius 2, in Gest. Concil. Basil. See also Platina in his life, p. 329.

‡‡ De Clericis conjug. can. cum. olim.

what reason there was for allowing it; he says, "There are many who cannot be hid for their multitude, nor do seek to be concealed through their impudence, who, being restrained from the nuptial remedies, run into all filthiness.* And another says, "That few in those days were free from fornication."† And Matthew Paris tells that the pope thought it almost a miracle that a candidate for a bishoprick was said to be a pure virgin. Whence the *Gloss. ad Gratian.* in the place just before quoted, ‡ calls fornication, but a venial sin. And it is tolerated, if not allowed, § however it was reckoned a less sin in a priest than marriage: for this reason, deadly sin is added to fornication in our litany. But why was celibacy enjoined to the priests? And why marriage a greater sin than fornication? Because the first is a breach of the command of the church, and the latter of the command of God! And the difference of the punishment of these in your church, shews that she thinks so; for a priest committing fornication comes off for a small penance, whereas if he marries he is degraded. May we not then say to the Church of Rome, as Christ to the Church of the Jews, in a parallel case? "Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition."||

But if marriage be such a defilement as is unworthy a priest, how came you to make a sacrament of it? I suppose you cannot mean less by a sacrament than a means of grace; you have made many less things so, as is shewed before. And would you deprive the clergy of any means of grace? Or is it your modesty to put them upon the level with the laity for depriving them of the cup in the sacrament of Christ's own institution?

"Marriage is honourable and undefiled in all," says the apostle; "no," say you, "it is neither in a priest." He says, "if men cannot contain, let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn;"¶ "no," say you, "it is better to burn than to marry." And this you must say, unless you suppose that all the many thousands of your clergy, and many of them young men, are every one of them endowed with the gift of continency. Which would be a miracle, if experience did not contradict it.

* De convers. ad cleric. cap. 29. † Gloss. ad Gratian. dist. 82, c. 5. ‡ Decret. P. Alex. 1. 3. tit. 2, c. 3. Gloss. ad Gratian, dist. 82, c. 5. § Ibid. dist. 34. c. 7. Costerus Enchirid. de Cœli-
bat. c. 17. || Mark vii. 9. ¶ 1 Cor. vii. 9.

All sober Christians, and even the Heathen, look upon marriage as a preserver and not a breach of chastity. St. Peter calls it a "chaste conversation."* If it were not so, we may presume that Christ would not have honoured it with his own presence, and with his first miracle, nor made it so frequently as he does, the type and representation of heaven, and of his union with the church, calling himself the bridegroom and her his spouse.

The Apostle says, "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband."† No, say you, we except all the clergy, the friars, and the nuns, whom we have put under vows to the contrary. And we will find other means for them to obtain the grace of continency! Yes, and the world is full of the effects of those means! And know whether they are better than those of God's appointment!

It is strange that you who have so many means of grace of your own, should not let those very few which Christ has made, stand as he left them!

41. But you extend yours farther than he did his, for he appointed none to be used for those in the other world. But you have offices to deliver souls out of purgatory.

Lord—That seems a charitable office.

Gentleman—But it is a very dark one. We have not a word in Scripture of any such state of the dead, where souls are put under pains equal to those of hell, except for the duration.

Lord—No unclean thing can enter into heaven.

Gentleman—Is not the blood of Christ sufficient to cleanse us from all unrighteousness?‡

Lord—Yes, surely, but though God pardons the guilt of sin, yet his justice will punish in some degree.

Gentleman—Then the guilt is not fully forgiven.

Lord—Not so, but that we may be punished for it, as when afflictions, diseases, &c. are sent to us here upon earth. God said to David, "I have put away thy sin, but the child shall die."§

Gentleman—And the reason is given in the next words, "because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme;" as if God did countenance such wickedness; therefore David was pun-

* 1 Pet. iii. 2. † 1 Cor. vii. 2. ‡ 1 John i. 9. 2 Sam. xii. 13.
§ Isa. xliii. 25.

ished so as his enemies might perceive it. God punishes here either to vindicate his own honour before men; or, for a trial of our faith, as in the case of Job, and to set forth such as examples to others; or for a proof and confirmation of our religion, as in the case of the prophets and apostles, confessors and martyrs; or to correct and recall obstinate sinners; many have been reformed by this means. But all these reasons respect this life only; for you say not that souls are made better in purgatory, since you suppose them to die in the love of God, and to be in his favour, before they go thither. And why then are they punished, since they are not purified by it?

Lord—To satisfy the vindictive justice of God.

Gentleman—That is satisfied before they are forgiven and received into the favour of God. Unless you mean by vindictive such a spite and revenge as is seen among the most ignoble part of mankind to say, “I will forgive, but I will at the same time be revenged for what is past;” which indeed is not forgiveness, but a plain unwillingness to forgive. But a generous forgiveness upon a sincere repentance, loves and embraces, and rejoices to comfort and heap favours, like the father of the returning prodigal. God says, “He will not remember our sins, that they shall not be mentioned unto us in the day when we turn from our wickedness.”* And how is that consistent with enduring the pains of hell for a hundred, perhaps a thousand years, for aught we know? And how do we know what souls go to purgatory? How long they remain there? and which of them are released? Can prayers then for the releasement of such and such be made in faith? Otherwise they are sin, by the apostle’s determination.

Lord—But the intention is pious.

Gentleman—So it is in all superstition, very pious, and that is it which deceives. But God has required that our zeal to him should be “according to knowledge;”† and that we, “intrude not into things we have not seen.”‡ We have not seen any revelation for purgatory, or the state of souls there.

Lord—But we have the tradition of the church for it.

Gentleman—There are good and bad traditions. And they are much oftener taken in the bad sense throughout

* Jer. xxxi. 34. Ezek. xviii. 22, xxxiii. 12, 16.

† Rom. x. 2.

‡ Col. ii. 18.

the New Testament. "Ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition"*—"Holding the tradition of the Elders."—Laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men"—Ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep "your own tradition—† Vain deceit, after the tradition of men"‡—Your vain "conversation received by tradition from your fathers,"§ &c.

Yet there is a tradition which (for the evidence of it) we are willing to admit, that is, according to the rule of *Vincentius Lirinensis*, *Quod semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, "That which was always received every where, and by all." And we are willing to join issue with you upon this tradition as to purgatory. This is universal tradition. And you would not desire we should be concluded by any particular tradition of this or that church or place, for you know there are many deceits in such.

But Vernon, in his rule of faith (a book much applauded in France, and put into English for the use of the Roman Catholics here) sets out in the beginning with a definition of the rule of faith, of which he makes the first requisite to be for an article of faith, that it be clearly revealed in Scripture (and by no pretended revelation since to any whatsoever) in express words, or thence to be deduced by necessary consequence. Which, when made appear as to purgatory (or any other of the doctrines in dispute) we shall readily allow it. And till then, we cannot be arraigned of heresy for not professing to believe it.

This "intruding into things we have not seen,"|| proceeds as the apostle observes, from a fleshly mind, measuring spiritual things by carnal. We see it takes time to purge the flesh of diseases and defilements it has contracted, and it takes a great deal of filing and scrubbing to cleanse iron that has been long rusted. Hence we conjecture the same as the souls departed, that they must be purged by fire. But the work of God upon the soul, when he grants true faith and repentance operates far otherwise; it effects the cure all at once, as with those who looked upon the brazen serpent. ¶ Our Saviour himself makes the comparison. And he gave us an example of it in the

* Matt. xv. 6.

§ 1 Pet. i.

† Mark vii. 3, 8, 9.

|| Col. ii. 18.

‡ Col. ii. 8.

¶ John iii. 14, 15.

thief upon the cross, who was translated to paradise* the same day he died. And yet, he had been a grievous sinner, and suffered justly for his offences; his repentance was late, and had made no restitution; yet he did no penance in purgatory.

Lord—That was an extraordinary case, his faith must be very strong to be converted upon the cross.

Gentleman—That is more than we know, whether he might not have been converted before. But however, it shews there is no necessity for purgatory, even for very great offenders.

Lord—No doubt God may excuse whom he pleases.

Gentleman—How then do we know whom he excuses, and whom not? And how can we pray in faith, that is, without sin, to deliver such a particular person from thence?

But if there be no necessity for it, as you have granted in the case of the thief, how is it to be imagined that God should keep so many thousand souls, for many years or ages, in the most extreme torments, when there was no necessity for it? And if the Pope has power to release out of purgatory, he must be a very cruel father who keeps one soul there an hour longer.

Lord—We see the church imposing penance and yet excusing some, shortening the time more than to others.

Gentleman—The church knows not the heart, and must judge by signs, which yet secure not from hypocrisy. But this is all foreign as to God, who searcheth the heart, and knoweth all that is in man. And though our physic of discipline works by degrees, and the issue is uncertain; yet God never cures imperfectly, Christ never half-healed any man. And so it is when he pardons sinners, “thy sins are forgiven thee.”† It is not said, “shall be forgiven,”‡ or when thou hast performed such and such penance, but the forgiveness of his sins was as immediately wrought as the cure of his body. And God gives us all the assurances that can be, in the strongest expressions, of our sins being absolutely and totally forgiven, as being “all blotted out, all cast into the depths of the sea, never to be remembered or mentioned unto us any more,” as before quoted. “I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely.”§ He is “ready to forgive.”|| He “waiteth

* Luke xxiii. 43. † Luke v. 20. ‡ Psal. li. 9. Isa. xlv. 22. Col. ii. 14. Mic. vii. 19. § Hos. xiv. 4. || Psal. xxxvi. 5.

to have mercy.”* He “earnestly remembereth.”† His “bowels are troubled” for sinners that they may repent, and “in the day they turn from their wickedness, he forgiveth.”‡ “For he doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men.”§ It is for their repentance and reformation, but that consideration is not in purgatory.

But how will the poor souls there (if any are there) be deluded, if the stock of supererogation should fail them, that is, the merits of saints for their good works which they have done over and above their duty, and what they were obliged to for their own salvation, and therefore are applied to others who had come short of their duty, to supply their deficiencies; which is the fund provided for the discharge of the prisoners in purgatory? And this is dispensed by the Pope to whom he thinks fit, as being the grand treasurer of the church, and consequently of these superabundant merits of the saints: but we want a text where St. Peter was constituted such a treasurer; or that there is or can be any such treasury. For can a creature merit, at the hands of God, for ever so great endowments bestowed upon him? Is it a merit to receive great gifts? And if we employ them to the best advantage, is it more than is our duty to do? And we are “still unprofitable servants,”|| as Christ himself has told us. But was there ever a man (Christ only excepted) who did all his duty? Are not all sinners? And if their repentance entitle them to pardon, yet this is far from merit? My doing my duty to-day makes no amends for my having neglected it yesterday. We find the greatest saints applying to the mercy of God, and not pleading their own merits. Jacob said, “I am not worthy of the least of all thy mercies.”¶ And Job, who had none like him in the earth, a perfect and upright man, &c. said, “I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes.”*** And Daniel, the man greatly beloved, confessed his own sins as well as the sins of the people. †† And St. Paul called himself “the chief of sinners, not worthy to be an apostle, &c.”‡‡ And if the Saints own no merit in themselves, then surely they will disown all those who apply to their merits; and, as I said before concerning the worship and invocation of them, by which you hope to

* Isa. xxx. 18. † Jer. xxxi. 20. ‡ Ezek xxxiii. 12. § Lam. iii. 33.

|| Luke xvii. 10. ¶ Gen. xxxii. 10. ** Job. i. 8. xlii. 6.

†† Dan. ix. 20, 23. ‡‡ 1 Tim. i. 15. 1 Cor. xv. 9.

gain them to be intercessors for you, they must become your accusers, by their denial of their acceptance of such worship from you, which if they should accept, it would make them evil spirits, as I have quoted out of St. Augustine.

But what creature dare plead purity before God? "Behold he chargeth his angels with folly, and he putteth no trust in his saints; yea the Heavens are not clean in his sight. How much more abominable and filthy is man, who drinketh iniquity like water? And what is man that he should be clean? And he that is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?*" And if "all our righteousness are as filthy rags;† if there be "iniquity in our holy things, in the holy sanctuary and altar;‡ what then is clean? And if "the righteous themselves shall scarcely be saved,"§ what merits have they to spare for others? Especially when they are not saved, even by their own works. "For by grace ye are saved; not of works, lest any man should boast."|| Can any man then boast of his works, as not only sufficient for his own salvation, but over and above as meritorious to be applied to others, and to deliver souls out of purgatory? No, my Lord, the saints make no such boasts: and will disown all those who make them in their name: for they know that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay, but by the law of faith."¶ And every man is saved by his own faith, not by the faith of others. And God will "reward every man according to his works,"** not the works of others. Miserable then is the condition of those souls supposed to be in purgatory, if they must not thence be delivered but by works of supererogation, when no man can be saved by his own works, for "we are saved, not according to our works, but according to the grace of God in Christ Jesus."†† "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, through Jesus Christ our Saviour."‡‡ Nor can be saved by the merits of any other:

* Job iv. 18. xv. 15. † Isa. lxiv. 6. ‡ Exod. xxviii. 38. Lev. xvi. 33. § 1 Pet. iv. 18. || Eph. ii. 8, 9. ¶ Rom. iii. 23, 24, 27. ** Mat. xvi. 27. †† 2 Tim. i. 9. ‡‡ Tit. 5. 6.

none other can merit from God. The greatest saint that ever was, is saved only by mercy, and the forgiveness of his sins. Let us therefore not trust to the supererogated works of those which were not able to save themselves. "That every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God."* "For in his sight shall no man living be justified. There is none righteous, no not one."†

But besides all this, there are degrees of glory in heaven: so that if any could supererogate, yet has he nothing to spare to others, because he has received the full of his reward himself. This shuts up purgatory for ever, by exhausting every penny of that treasury reserved for redemption from thence.

And the expectation of having those many sins, called venial with you, remitted after death, does naturally make men more careless in their life: and trusting to the merits of others, will abate their diligence in being nicely righteous themselves.

Lord—But we find some instances among the Fathers of prayers for the dead.

Gentleman—Some few among the Fathers you may, but none in Scripture. But what were these prayers? They were for peace and rest to those who were supposed to be in peace, yet might receive increase of happiness even before the resurrection, as some suppose Heaven itself to consist in an eternal increase of bliss. But without this, we may pray for continuance of peace to those who are in peace, though we know it will surely be; as when we pray, "thy kingdom come. Thy will be done." We know it must be, but this shews our assent and wishes for it. And in this sense we also pray for the dead, that it would please God "shortly to accomplish the number of his elect, and to hasten his kingdom; that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of his holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in his eternal and everlasting glory."‡ And we bless him, "for his servants departed this life in his faith and fear; beseeching him to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of his

* Rom. iii. 19.

† Psalm cxiv. 2.

‡ Order for the Burial of the Dead.

heavenly kingdom.”* So that we pray for them as well as for ourselves, that we, “with them may be partakers,” &c. But neither these prayers of ours, nor those of the ancients, have any relation to purgatory, or delivering souls from thence, as from a place of torment.

Some of the ancients had an imagination of a purging fire, through which sinners were to pass, but they meant the general conflagration at the last day, which comes not at all to your notion of Purgatory. But I would not trouble your Lordship with excursions, or debating every branch of these disputes, only give you a summary view of the heart of the cause, and to see where the matter pinches. And indeed, my Lord, my endeavour with your Lordship is rather to state the case, than to argue upon it; for truth needs no more than to be fairly shewn; it convinces of itself, and best when it is naked, without the fucus of philosophy and distinctions, which are endless.

These will put a colour upon implicit itself, and make you believe you understand what you know nothing of! My Lord, give me leave to say, your whole religion is implicit, not only as to the particular points we have discoursed, but your whole public worship is such, while your prayers are in a language not understood by the people. How then can they “pray with the understanding,”† as the apostle requires? And “how can they say amen, seeing they understand not what is said?”

Lord—They have prayers of their own, and carry little prayer-books with them, which they read while the Priest is repeating the public offices.

Gentleman—But this is not joining with the priest; and they cannot say Amen to his prayers.

What then have they to do at church? This is not communion; it is purely implicit, and nothing else but *opus operatum*. It is an invention without precedent, for it never entered into the head of man or church since the creation, except only the Church of Rome: and of which the apostle gives this character, “Will they not say ye are mad?”‡

What is it short of this which Suarez says, “That it is not necessary to prayer that the person praying should

* Communion Office. Prayer for the Church Militant.

† 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 16. ‡ 1 Cor. xiv. 23.

think of what he speaks."* This is *opus operatum* with a witness! And a parrot may be taught thus to pray. And how do they pray with the priest who are talking of business, or chatting of news, while he is offering up their prayers to God in a language of which they understand not one word, and therefore cannot give attention to it? And these are the greatest number, viz. of the common people, who cannot read, and so cannot carry private books of devotion with them; though if they did, it would not be joining with the priest, nor could these be called Common Prayers, which are offered up with "one accord," pursuant to St. Chrysostom's prayer, with which our daily public prayers do conclude.

And now, my Lord, upon the whole, if the advantage does not seem to your Lordship to lie on our side, in all the particulars before-mentioned, yet can you have any doubt of the safety of your soul in our way? Since all our danger is, omitting some things that might be profitable, but cannot be called necessary. Whereas if the error lies on your side, you are involved in manifold superstitions, and of adding to, and subtracting from the word of God.

Lord—I confess nothing sticks with me but the Church of being in the Church, and preserving the unity of the Church.

Gentleman—Therefore I began with that, and desire to close with it, for it is the *jugulum causæ*.

I have showed wherein the unity of the church did consist, according to the institution of Christ, and as the primitive fathers understood it; that is, an unity in faith, and in the mutual love and good correspondence of Christians and sister churches, though one sister must be elder than another, and Rome was not the eldest. One might be greater or more powerful than another, and this did vary according to the course of this world: Jerusalem was at first the only church of Christ, then Antioch became the greatest of the Gentile church, where Christianity first received its name; afterwards Rome became the greatest from being the seat of the Roman empire, but Constantinople was the first assumed an universal supremacy, when she became the head of that empire. And this was it which broke the unity of the sister churches, and filled

* De Orat. lib. 3, c. 14, and Salmeron, &c.

them with schisms and divisions among themselves, one affecting superiority over another, and increasing it to an absolute temporal dominion; of which Christ said to the apostles, "It shall not be so among you;"* and again, (for they contended more than once for the superiority,) after the institution and celebration of the holy eucharist, just as he was going to enter upon his sacred passion, and to take his final leave of them, this dispute arose again, "Which of them should be the greatest," and that was the time to determine it for ever; but he again checked their ambition, and the error of their thought, as if the church were to be governed with temporal sway and authority, like the grandeur of secular princes, but told them plainly, "Ye shall not be so."†

And in his farewell sermon, continued upon the same occasion, and at the same time, he insisted much upon their unity, and placed it not upon the superiority of any one of them over the others, but in their mutual love and good agreement with each other, in their union with God and with himself, upon which he wonderfully expatiates in most exalted words, which take up four whole chapters in St. John, and begins "Little children, yet a little while I am with you—A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another—By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another:"‡ this is the unity of which Christ speaks in these his last words to the apostles. He said, "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight."§ But he that calls himself *Servus Servorum*, the servant of his servants, has fought and raised bloody wars in defence, as he says, of this his Master's kingdom! And he will have the government of it just the same as of other kingdoms of the world, and its unity to consist, like theirs, in being under one absolute and despotic head or king. But no kingdom of the earth will content him—he will be universal monarch of the whole world. And why? Because Christ is the Head of all churches, and therefore must have an universal vicar. And from the same parity of reason, because "God is the King of all the earth,"|| therefore he must have an universal vicar in temporals. And if England, France, Spain, &c. should contend which

* Mat. xx. 25. † Luke xxii. 26. ‡ John xiii. 33.

§ John xviii. 36.

|| Psal. xlvii. 7.

of them were this universal vicar, would not the answer be easy? that the contest was foolish and vain; for though one kingdom might be greater or more ancient than another, yet was it still but a part of the whole, that is, of the world: and that God had appointed no such universal vicar. The case is exactly parallel, unless it can be showed, that Christ has appointed such an universal vicar in the church, and told us plainly who it is, that we may obey him: which when done, we will own ourselves heretics, schismatics, and what you will, till we return and pay our obedience to him.

But, on the other hand, if Christ has appointed no such universal vicar, then are you under a mortal mistake concerning the unity of the church, which you place wholly upon our being united in obedience to such an one: and your church is the great breaker of ecclesiastical unity, while she will bear no sister church, but will be the mother of all churches, though she be not the eldest.

This, my Lord, is the very heart of the cause. And we are verily persuaded that there is not the least ground for this universal supremacy, either in the Holy Scriptures, or in Antiquity, or in the reason of the thing, or, in fact, since the first foundation of Christianity to this day, or that it was ever acknowledged, or is now, by the majority of Christian churches; and yet this is the foundation of all the disputes betwixt your church and ours and all other Christian churches.

Christ foresaw the consequences of trusting an universal supremacy in the hands of fallible men. An universal king must ruin the world, for appeals to him must lie in all causes from all the parts of the earth, and men must attend with their witnesses, and all other things necessary to carry on a law-suit. The oppression of this (beyond all other tyrannies) may appear by the appeals to Rome, in the times of popery, no farther than from England thither, where causes lasted from age to age, loudly complained of in those times, and attempts made to restrain it in some measure by several of our acts of Parliament, but not to purpose till the Reformation. And this indeed made the reformation even necessary, for the preservation of the people, as well laity as clergy, who groaned under this burden, which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear. Dr. Parker, late lord bishop of Oxford, in his excellent Discourse sent to the late King James, when he was archdeacon of Canterbury, printed here in the year

1690, says upon this head, p. 29, "I myself enjoy a small office in this church, wherein my predecessors had a suit for a privilege belonging to it, hanging in the court of Rome for some hundreds of years, till the very time of the dissolution of the Pope's power." Hence we may judge how it would be with the churches in the Indies, and the most remote places in the world, if it were all under his power, as he pretends! But the good providence of God has not suffered it to extend to half of the Christian churches, (as is before said,) and his wisdom and goodness has still preserved the major part of true Protestants against this usurpation; besides the great number he has rescued from it, and has never suffered any of these reformed churches or nations to return to it again, as before has been observed. And besides that the principle itself, and the pretensions of the Pope to this universal and unlimited supremacy are beat down and exploded by the Gallican church, and others the most learned who still remain in his communion, whether he will or not, and though he excommunicates them afresh every year!

And now, my Lord, I cannot but think it made plain to a demonstration, that this universal supremacy is a thing impracticable; and that if it could be in fact, it would be the greatest ruin and oppression to the church that is possible. And if an universal king would be insupportable to the world, how much more an universal bishop to the church? For he must have an absolute dominion over our faith, over the Holy Scriptures, and over the church, which must suddenly fall (as I before quoted Gregory the Great) if it comes to depend upon one: and whoever should assume it would be, as he prophesied, a Lucifer, and the forerunner of Antichrist. And can he be less, if he has usurped so vast an authority, and infallibility itself to support it?

I said before that an universal king would make all wars to be rebellion, and so incurable but by utter destruction. Thus it is with the universal bishop; opposing his supremacy is heresy, schism, and excommunication; and is the only article in your creed to be believed explicitly. As for the others, implicit will do for them all! that is, it is no matter whether you believe them or not, so the sovereignty of the universal bishop be maintained inviolably!

But though every king is not a bishop, yet the universal bishop must likewise be universal king, with power to depose all kings at his pleasure: of this I have spoken at large.

And though nothing need be said to this almighty claim, both in spirituals and temporals, but to put you to the proof of its institution by Christ, who disowned all civil power himself, and said, "Who made me a judge?"* yet I have gone farther, (that this cause might be put out of all dispute,) and showed the inconsistency of your own claim to be the only Catholic church, and to enjoy the true unity of it, in these particulars following.

1. There never was a church called Catholic, in the sense of Rome, that is, which was owned by all other churches as their head, at least since that of Jerusalem.

Lord—But we admit none other to be Christian churches but those who do own it.

Gentleman—That is to say, it must do one way or other ; if the mountain will not come to Mahomet, Mahomet must go to the mountain. It is like the bed Procrustes made to fit all persons, by stretching those to the length of it who were shorter, and cutting off part of those who were longer than it. Thus the church of Rome becomes universal, by stretching her communion to those who stand excommunicated by her, and cutting off all churches who will not own her supremacy. And thus she must still be universal, though she had no more left than the diocese of Rome ; or suppose none but the Pope himself, then he would be the universal church ! And it may well be preserved in a Pope, if it may in one laic, a woman, or an infant.

2. And then there will be perfect unity, and I am afraid not till then : for perfect unity is not only in outward communion, that is, being within the same walls together ; or in subscribing a formula of articles of faith, half of which must be believed implicitly : but an unity likewise in saving or damning principles and practices, in love and charity, for which chiefly we shall be judged at the last day.† If these are wanting, the unity will be very imperfect, and stand us in little stead.

3. There ought to be also an unity where to place your infallibility (else it is none) of which I have given four schemes, each one contradictory to all the rest, and not yet determined by your church. And this is an unity in faith among you. It is the foundation upon which your church is built.

4. There must be an unity and full agreement which of

* Luke xii. 14.

† Matth. xxv. 31, &c.

the articles of your creed are to be believed explicitly, and which implicitly ; that is indeed which are necessary to be believed, and which not? Without this your faith is wholly uncertain.

And till these things be adjusted, you cannot be said to have unity even in faith.

And if you have not unity in faith, nor in those principles and practices which are no less necessary to salvation ; nor in that love and charity which Christ has made the characteristic of Christians, and without which "no man can know who are his disciples :"* but instead of that, if you have envyings and strife among you, among your several religious orders, betwixt national and national church, concerning the infallibility and supremacy of the pope, and of his power to depose princes, upon which the peace and unity of the world, and our eternal salvation does depend ; and, in short, if you have no unity concerning your rule of faith itself, or of your practice, what will the unity of outward communion do, upon which you lay the whole stress ? It will not so much as denominate you Christians, far less to be the only Christians in the world, or the Catholic church.

It is true that unity in communion is a desirable thing, and ought to be preserved among all churches ; but it is still a part only of the unity of the church, as I have showed. And that the supremacy of the Pope has been the chief cause of the breach of it. But yet it is not such a breach as destroys all other parts of the unity of the church, their unity in one Lord, one faith, one baptism. It may be called an essential part of the perfect unity of the church ; but, alas ! what is perfect upon earth ? And it is not so essential as that the want of it should quite unchurch ; so that if there were not a church upon earth that did communicate with another, yet they would not all cease, for that cause only, to be Christian churches. As if all the nations in the world were at war with each other, yet it would be the same world still, and God's one kingdom upon earth, and each nation a part of it.

Lord—But the unity of the church ought to be more than that of the temporal world.

Gentleman—True : but we say, *Magis et minus non variant speciem*, "that more or less alter not the kind," as

* John xiii. 35.

a greater or less quantity of gold (for example) alters not the species of the gold ; so unity is unity, be it more or less. And there is an unity among all nations, even though at war ; the unity of blood and of reason, being all made of one blood, and all endowed with the same reason, which makes them all agree in some common principles, and all appeal to reason in the justice of their wars. But this unity is not perfect while they bite and devour one another.

And though the unity is greater, where revelation is added to reason, and men agree in the same religion which we call the church ; yet this unity is not perfect while there are disputes, animosities, and various opinions about it. And in the church of Rome herself there are great variety of opinions among those of her communion, and animosities thereupon raised, so great as gives her much trouble to compose, and sometimes finds it past her power, and is forced to be what she cannot remedy.

Lord—What do you mean, then, by the holy Catholic church in the creed ?

Gentleman—This article was but late put into the creed, on occasion of divisions which arose among the churches, to mind them that they were all members of the same body, of the one Catholic church. The next article explains this, and may be called a part of it, viz. the communion of saints, and these are only the elect, who are not visible upon earth ; and therefore must be referred to heaven, where only is the true communion of saints, without mixture of the reprobate, who are not members of Christ, and but in appearance of the church. We have no unity of the spirit with these, and consequently are not one body with them : “ For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness ? and what communion hath light with darkness ? and what concord hath Christ with Belial ? ”* And what unity hath that church where these are mixed together ? Therefore the archetypal and truly Catholic church in heaven, is that which is chiefly and principally meant by the holy Catholic church, and the communion of saints in the creed. And *there* only is perfect unity—*there* is the great body of the church—there are but few at a time upon earth, and of them we know not which belong to that truly Catholic church or not ; and who do not, cannot be truly Catholics, though they

* 2 Cor. vi. 14.

bear that name with us. And of them so called, you yourselves will not say that there is perfect unity among them, in all the necessary and most essential parts of it before mentioned.

But if that article in the creed had been meant in your sense, it must have been the holy Roman Catholic Church, and not left us to seek where to find this church, the infallible guide. And you yourselves have not found it, while you are in quite contrary opinions where to find it. But by leaving it in the general and indefinitely under the name of the Catholic church only, it is rather exclusive of any particular church, and extends to all Christian churches which make up the Catholic church upon earth, in such an unity as our fallen state will bear, where human passions are not subdued, but mix themselves in our religious as well as temporal concerns. Therefore, by the unity of the church you cannot mean a perfect unity; no, not even with your head, and in doctrines which are indispensable towards your eternal salvation, as in the deposing doctrine, upon which the apostle has pronounced damnation; and which, if not true, Cardinal Perron, as before quoted, gives up the Church of Rome, for many ages past, for the very synagogue of Antichrist. See also the morals of the Jesuits, which though condemned by some, are defended by others. This is not perfect unity even in necessities; and the *Bulla in Cæna* breaks it to pieces, where whole churches and nations are excommunicated of those you say are in the unity of the church, and in his communion who has excommunicated them!

But if we will be content with no unity in the church but what is perfect in all things, the consequence must be, that we have no unity at all; as our pretence to infallibility is the greatest instance of our fallibility. And if we will have no guide but who is infallible, we must have none upon earth. And so the church is rendered wholly useless to us, if we may not take their help, as instructors and rational guides, or in the apostle's words, as "helpers of our joy," without giving them the "dominion over our faith."*

And indeed the security you demand of an outward infallible guide, is altering the course of nature, or, as I called it, finding fault with the creation; for God has

made us rational creatures, and given us no other guide but our own reason, with the assistance of his grace, to come at the knowledge of himself, and consequently of all other things. And to find fault with this, is the clay saying to the potter, "why hast thou made me thus?" To bid us divest ourselves wholly of our reason, or to believe implicitly, which is the same thing; and is not in our power, whatever we may think, because reason is our nature; and that we should not believe our outward senses, is indeed to make us other creatures than God has made us. And to refuse the assistance of a church, because she is not infallible, is depriving ourselves of a means which God has appointed; and is the same perverseness, as if we should refuse to consult a lawyer or physician, because it is possible they may err in their judgment. But though I allow their skill to be better than mine, in their several professions, yet we still keep to ourselves so much use of our reason, that if I knew it was poison the physician were going to give me, I would not take it; and there are some things so plain, that no lawyer could persuade me to. Much more ought we to be careful in our eternal concerns, and not to give ourselves up implicitly to any whatsoever, that if they should direct us against the most express commands in Scripture, or the dictates of reason and common morality, or bid us deny all our senses, we must acquiesce without any examining! This is abandoning both sense and reason which God gave us as a guide, and, therefore, will require it of us; and this only is that which will render us self-condemned, and bear witness against us at the last day; for, as I said, it is not in our power to extinguish reason in us; though we may blindfold it, and keep it down for a time, yet it will recoil upon us, and convict us, wherein we have departed from it. Without this there could not be such a thing as a sting of conscience, for what is that but a check to our reason? What else is repentance or returning from any error, or from any evil we have done? You endeavour to convert men to your church wholly upon their reason, for you can have no other topic whereby to lay hold of an adversary; in vain, therefore, would you persuade him to trust to that choice of his reason, in coming over to you, but never to trust any other choice his reason should make afterwards, because it is very fallible. I say this could not go down with any man, but it must make him

doubt whether his reason has led him right in the first choice too of going to your church, and from the same argument, because his reason is very fallible. God says to us, "come now and let us reason together."* We ask no more of you; nay, you cannot refuse it us, whether you will or not; for your own reason will, as I said, one time or other return upon you, and convince you of obstinacy in not hearkening to reason, for without this you cannot be said to have acted according to reason. This renders me inexcusable, whether I be right or wrong; for if my reason misleads me after due examination, the error is human, and will not be more easily pardoned; but if I will not hear, if I will not open my eyes, it makes me guilty though I were in the right, because that is by chance, and not my choice upon reasonable conviction, which I have refused. And truth is never afraid, for the more it is canvassed it appears the brighter. It is strange to see those who pretend to such an assurance as is infallible, and yet seek to avoid the light of reason, as if afraid of being detected! and to confess it in the very body of their canon law, where they excommunicate any laick, who shall publicly or privately dispute concerning the Catholic faith.

This method will secure to them all that they have caught; but if observed by others as well as by themselves, they would never catch another. And it is a plain indication that who are against reason, reason is against them.

For if reason could be heard, it would make it very obvious to you, that in all the particular points before mentioned, the certainty is on our side, and the doubt, at least, on yours. For example, none make a doubt but that we may lawfully pray to God, and not before any image of him; or without the worship or invocation of any saint joined with him: and so of all the rest. But on your part, if what I have said make them not appear unlawful to your Lordship, yet they must remain at least doubtful, till some stronger evidence be produced for them

* Isaiah i. 18.

† Inhibemus quoque ne cuicumque Laicæ personæ liceat publicè vel privatim de Fide Catholicâ disputare. Qui verò contrà fecerit, Excommunicationis laqueo innodetur. *Corp. Jur. Can. Sext. Decretal. lib. Quint. Tit. ii. cap. ii. § 1.* Paris 1687.

than has hitherto been given. There is not a prayer in the public offices of our church to which you may not heartily say, Amen, in full faith and assurance; which is impossible to say as to purgatory, invocation of saints, &c. And then such prayers must be sinful. Rom. xiv. 23.

But you are pinned down in all these particular points by the authority of a supposed universal bishop, wherein likewise you place the unity of the church. And yet there never was such a bishop, or universal monarch, unless any prince calling himself so, would make him such. What is an universal monarch who was never owned by half of those he calls his subjects; and whose authority is limited and restrained, and his excommunications despised, by those who pretend to own him, and to be subject to him? What is it to fancy one's self king of all the earth, and to place the unity of the world in such a monarch as never was in the world; and to call those rebels from him, who never were in subjection to him? This, my Lord, I have showed to be the case of the greatest part of the Christian churches, and from the beginning. And consequently this universal supremacy is merely imaginary; it was never named by Christ, nor ever was in fact. And so far is it from being the centre of unity, that the pretence to it has been the great breach of unity among Christian churches, and is at this day: for this is it which stops the bishops in the communion of Rome from exercising the freedom of their own judgments, and that authority which Christ has given them over their own flocks, and will require an account of it from them; and which was freely exercised by the bishops in the primitive church; and which, if restored, would open the way to that Catholic communion so greatly desired, and wherein the true unity of the church does consist. Which never can be hoped, while a negative is given to the Pope in all the particular points disputed, and especially concerning his own supremacy. But if the bishops of his communion would think themselves at liberty and under obligation to act of themselves, as in the primitive church, and as ordained by Christ, the points we have discoursed as to doctrine and worship seem to me so very plain, that there could be no dispute, which were the safer side to take; at least that it would not be thought a sin to purge their public offices as that other Christians might lawfully join in them; and let opinions remain as opinions, not made

articles of faith, and conditions of communion. And to this nothing stands in the way of the Bishops of France, at least, but the fear of that excommunication from the Pope, which is renewed against them every year, and which they pretend not to regard. But they are kept under by the shadow of the phantom of an universal supremacy, which never was in being; and if it were, would be insupportable, and ruin the church; and which they themselves have in effect already rejected, as inconsistent with the liberties of the Gallican, or any other national Church, and has bred all the dispute betwixt them and the Church of Rome; and never can be healed in good earnest, if the Pope be judge of the controversy. See then the cause of the breach of Catholic unity.

And now, my Lord, forgive me, for I am sensible that there is an uneasiness at first, and a prejudice to hear any thing contrary to those principles in which one has been educated from his infancy, and thinks most certain. But this must be overcome so far as to hear reason, which will confirm us the more if we be in the truth, or otherwise convince us of our error; at least make it so far excusable, that we have not refused the reasonable means of information. Without this, no man could have been a Christian at first, nor has been since but by accident, according to the place where he was born, or received his education. But the prophet calls a due examination of these things, a "shewing ourselves to be men."* And St. Luke gives it the character of a nobleness of spirit in those who "searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so;† and, "therefore," says he, "many of them believed," of the honourable, both men and women. Whilst those bigoted, who stuck to implicit faith in the church, it is said, "believed not, but were moved with envy,"‡ and stirred up persecution against those who disturbed them in their security, like waking one out of his sleep; though when it is done he will thank those who have raised him from darkness to light, to seeing with his own eyes, instead of being led by others implicitly in the dark, and lulled into dreams of security from his blindness, in which he is persuaded there is less danger of stumbling, than if his eyes were open, because every man's sight is not good, and has deceived many! Have I not

* Isai. xlv. 8.

† Acts xvii. 11, 12.

‡ Acts xvii. 5.

taken a horse for a man at a distance? And does not a stick look crooked in the water? Why then should I trust my eyes any more? This is all the reason ever I could hear, for not trusting to our reason! And what is the remedy proposed? If it were to give us rules whereby to judge of true reason, to help it, and to trim this lamp which God has lighted for us, this would be rational, like clearing our eyes if they were dim. But the remedy you propose, is to shut reason quite out, to make no more use of it, to silence, to extinguish it, and take implicit faith in its room; like pulling out one's eyes, because they are not good, and choosing to be led by the hand, and never examine our way any more. But I think the apostle recommends examining to us, and I will conclude with his advice: "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." 1 Thess. v. 21.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

EX BULLARIO LAERTII CHERUBINI. ROMÆ, 1688.

TOM. III. P. 183.

CONSTITUTIO PAULI V. 63. THE 63d. CONSTITUTION OF PAUL V.

Excommunicatio et anathematizatio quorumcunque hæreticorum, eorumque fautorum, ac schismaticorum, vel ecclesiasticam libertatem lædentium, aut quoquo modo dispositis in hâc Bullâ, de more in die Cœnæ Domini publicari solitâ, contravenientium.

Quoad omnia quasi capitula hujus Bullæ (ultra Extravagan. 3 Pauli II. et Extravagan. 5. Sixti IV. in tit. de pœnitentia et remissionibus) habes supra Constitut. I. Urbani V. fol. 215. Constitut. 25. Julii II. f. 482. Constitut. 10. Pauli III. f. 522. necnon Constitut. 81. Gregori XIII. f. 348. l. 2. Aliorum autem Bullas ejusmodi Cœnæ Domini nuncupantes volens prætermisi, his duntaxat contentus, ex quibus pro temporum conditione Romanos pontifices aliquid immutâsse cognoscatur. Non tamen posthabui proximè

The excommunication and anathematization of all heretics whatsoever, and their favours, and schismatics, or of those who violate the ecclesiastical liberty, or any ways infringe the contents of this Bull, which is wont to be published on Maunday Thursday.

As for almost all the chapters of this Bull, (besides the 3d Extravagant of Paul II. and the 5th Extravagant of Sixtus IV. in the title of penance and remissions) you have them before ordained in the first Constitution of Urban V. f. 215. in the 25th Constitution of Julius II. f. 482. in the 10th Constitution of Paul III. f. 522. and in the 81st Constitution of Gregory XIII. f. 348. lib. 2. Other Bulls of this nature, called Bulls in Cœnâ Domini, I have purposely omitted, being content with these; from which it may appear

indicandas, utl apprime necessarias, et super hujus Bullæ capitibus specialiter editas.

that the popes have made some variation in them, according to the exigency of the times. Yet I would not omit those which follow, as being especially necessary, and particularly published upon the several chapters of this Bull.

Extat ergo in hoc opere specialis edita sanctio Nicolai III. circa § primum hujus Bullæ in ejus Const. 2. sup. fol. 143. et circa §. 2. extat. Const. 5. Pii II. f. 290. l. i. Circa §. 4. extat Const. 7. Pii V. f. 137. l. 2. Circa §. 7. extat Const. 3. Nicolai V. f. 283. l. i. Circa §. 10. extat Canon Callisti. l. in c. 23. caus. 24. q. 3. Circa §. 11. respectu Cardinalium extat Const. 16. Leonis X. f. 420. l. 1. et alia 93. Pii. V. f. 222. l. 2. Circa §. 12. extat Const. 11. Alexandri VI. f. 352. Circa §. 14. extat Const. 2. Martini V. f. 239. et alia 17. Innocentii VIII. f. 343. ac altera 30. Leonis IX. f. 440. necnon alia 39. Clementis VII. f. 505. l. 1. et altera 19. Gregorii XIII. f. 290. l. 2. Circa §. 15. multi sunt Canones in Corpore Juris, et extat Const. 10. Martini V. f. 247. Circa §. 19. extat Const. 3. Urbani VI. f. 222. Et Circa §. 20. extat Const. 8. Joannis XXII. f. 174. et alia 3. Clementis VI. f. 212. alia 13. Leonis X. f. 314. et altera 11. Pauli IV. f. 595.

There is extant, therefore, in this collection a particular edict of Nicholas III. about the 1st section of this Bull in his 2nd Constitution, Sup. fol. 143. Concerning sect. 2. there is extant Const. 5. of Pius II. f. 290. l. 1. Concerning §. 4. there is extant Const. 7. of Pius V. f. 137. l. 2. Concerning §. 7. is extant, Const. 3. of Nicholas V. f. 283. l. 1. Concerning §. 10. is extant a canon of Callistus, in c. 23. Const. 24. qu. 3. Concerning §. 11. in respect of the Cardinals is extant Const. 16. of Leo. X. f. 420. l. 1. and Const. 93. of Pius V. f. 222. l. 2. Concerning §. 12. is extant Const. 11. of Alexander VI. f. 352. Concerning §. 14. is extant Const. 2. of Martin V. f. 293. and Const. 17. of Innocent VIII. f. 343. and Const. 30. of Leo. X. f. 440 and Const. 39. of Clement VII. f. 505. l. 1. and Const. 19. of Gregory XIII. f. 290. l. 2. Concerning §. 15. are many canons in the body of the law, and Const. 10. of Martin V. f. 247. Concerning § 19. is extant Const. 3

of Urban VI. f. 222. Concerning §. 20. is extant Const. 8. of John XXII. f. 174. and Const. 3. of Clement VI. f. 212. and Const. 13. of Leo X. f. 314. and Const. 11. of Paul IV. f. 595.

Alia hujusmodi excommunicatio in die Cœnæ Domini promulgari solita est in S. D. N. Urbani VIII. Const. 62. Pastoralis inf. Tom. 4.

Another like excommunication usually published on Maunday Thursday, is extant in the 62d Constitution of our holy Lord Urban VIII. inf. Tom. 4.

Paulus Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

Paul Bishop, servant of the servants of God, in perpetual memory of the thing now decreed.

Pastoralis Romani pontificis vigilantia et sollicitudo, cum in omni reipublicæ Christianæ pace et tranquillitate procurandâ pro sui muneris officio assiduè versatur, tum potissimum in catholicæ fidei sine quâ impossibile est placere Deo unitate atque integritate retinendâ, maximè elucet : Nimirum ut fideles Christi non sint parvuli fluctuantes, neque circumferantur omni vento doctrinæ in nequitia hominum ad circumventionem erroris, sed omnes occurrant in unitate fidei et agnitionis filii Dei in virum perfectum, neque se in hujus vitæ societate et communione lædant, aut inter se alter alteri offensionem præbeant ; sed potius in vinculo charitatis conjuncti, tanquam

The pastoral vigilance and care of the bishop of Rome, being by the duty of his office continually employed in procuring by all means the peace and tranquillity of Christendom, is more especially eminent in retaining and preserving the unity and integrity of catholic faith, without which it is impossible to please God ; that so the faithful of Christ may not be as children wavering, nor be carried about with every wind of doctrine by the cunning craft of men, whereby they lay in wait to deceive ; but that all may meet in the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man ; that in the communion and society of this life they may not injure nor offend

unius corporis membra sub Christo capite, ejusq; in terris vicario Romano Pontifice beatissimi Petri successore, à quo totius ecclesiæ unitas dimanat, augeantur in ædificatione, atque ita divinâ gratiâ adjutrice sic præsentis vitæ quiete gaudeant, ut futurâ quoque beatitudine perfruantur. Ob quas sanè causas Romani pontifices prædecessores nostri hodiernâ die, quæ anniversariâ Dominicæ Cœnæ commemoratione solennis est, spiritualem ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ gladium, et salutaria justitiæ arma per ministerium summi apostolatûs ad Dei gloriam et animarum salutem solenniter exercere consueverunt. Nos igitur, quibus nihil optabilius est, quàm fidei inviolatam integritatem, publicam pacem et justitiam, Deo auctore, tueri, vetustum et solennem hunc morem sequentes.

§. 1. Excommunicamus et anathematizamus ex parte Dei Omnipotentis, Patris et Filii et Spiritûs Sancti, auctoritate quoque Beatorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli, ac nostrâ, quoscunq; Hussitas, Wicliephistas, Lutheranos, Zuinglianos, Calvi-

one another; but rather being joined together with the bond of charity, as members of one body under Christ the head, and his vicar upon earth the bishop of Rome, St. Peter's successor, from whom the unity of the whole church doth flow, may be increased in edification, and by the assistance of the divine grace may so enjoy the tranquillity of this present life, that they may also attain eternal happiness. For which reasons the bishops of Rome, our predecessors, upon this day, which is dedicated to the anniversary commemoration of our Lord's Supper, have been wont solemnly to exercise the spiritual sword of ecclesiastical discipline, and wholesome weapons of justice, by the ministry of the supreme apostolate to the glory of God and salvation of souls. We, therefore, desiring nothing more than by the guidance of God to preserve inviolable the integrity of faith, public peace and justice; following this ancient and solemn custom.

§. 1. We excommunicate and anathematize, in the name of God Almighty, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and by the authority of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own, all Hussites, Wiclephists, Lutherans, Zuinglians, Calvin-

nistas, Ugonottes, Anabaptistas, Trinitarios, et à Christianà fide apostatas, ac omnes et singulos alios hæreticos, quocunque nomine ceanseantur, et cujuscunque sectæ existant; ac eis credentes, eorumque receptatores, fautores, et generaliter quoslibet illorum defensores; ac eorundem libros hæresin continentes, vel de religione tractantes, sine auctoritate nostrâ et sedis apostolicæ scienter legentes aut retinentes, imprimentes, seu quomodolibet defendentes, ex quâvis causâ publice vel occultè, quovis ingenio vel colore; necnon schismaticos, et eos qui se à nostra et Romani pontificis pro tempore existentes obedientiâ pertinaciter subtrahunt vel recedunt.

§. 2. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes et singulos, cujuscunque status, gradûs, seu conditionis, fuerint; universitates, collegia, et capitula, quocunque nomine nuncupentur, interdicimus, ab ordinationibus seu mandatis nostris ac Romanorum pontificum pro tempore existentium ad universale futurum concilium appellantes; necnon eos quorum auxillo vel favore appellatum fuerit.

§. 3. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes piratas, cursarios, ac latrunculos maritimos, dis-

istis, Hugonots, Anabaptists, Trinitarians, and Apostles from the Christian faith, and all other heretics by whatsoever name they are called, and of whatsoever sect they be; as also their adherents, receivers, favourers, and generally any defenders of them; together with all who without our authority, or that of the apostolic see, knowingly read, keep, print, or any ways for any cause whatsoever publicly or privately on any pretext or colour defend their books containing heresy, or treating of religion; as also schismatics, and those who withdraw themselves, or recede obstinately from the obedience of us, or the bishop of Rome for the time being.

§. 2. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all and singular, of whatsoever station, degree or condition they be; and interdict all Universities, Colleges and Chapters, by whatsoever name they are called, who appeal from the orders or decrees of us, or the popes of Rome, for the time being, to a future general council; and those by whose aid and favour the appeal was made.

§. 3. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all pirates, corsairs and robbers by sea, roving about

currentes mare nostrum, præcipuè à Monte Argentario usque ad Terracinam, ac omnes eorum fautores, receptatores et defensores.

§. 4. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes et singulos, qui Christianorum, quorumcunq; navibus tempestate, seu in transversum (ut dici solet) jactatis, vel quoquo modo naufragium passis, seu in ipsis navibus, sive ex eisdem ejecta in mare, vel in litore inventa, cujuscunq; generis bona, tam in nostris, Tyrrheni et Adriatici, quàm in cæteris cujusque maris regionibus et littoribus, surriperint; ita ut nec ob quodcunque privilegium, consuetudinem aut longissimi etiam immemorabilis temporis possessionem, seu alium quemcunque prætextum excusari possint.

§. 5. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes qui in terris suis nova pedagia seu gabellas, præterquam in casibus sibi à jure, seu ex speciali sedis apostolicæ licentiâ permissis, imponunt vel augent, seu imponi vel augeri prohibita exigunt.

§. 6. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes falsarios literarum apostolicarum, etiam in formâ brevis, ac supplicationum, gratiam vel justitiam concernentium, per Romanum

our sea, chiefly from Mount Argentiére to Terracina, and all their abettors, receivers, and defenders.

§. 4. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all and singular, who, when the ships of any Christians are either driven out of the way by tempest, or any way suffer shipwreck, convey away any goods of what kind soever, either in the ship themselves, or cast out of the ships into the sea, or found on the shore, as well in our Tyrrhenian and Adriatic seas, as in any other divisions of shores of all seas whatsoever; so that they shall not be excused by any privilege, custom, or possession of time immemorial, or any other pretext whatsoever.

§. 5. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all who impose or augment any new tolls or gabells in their dominions, except in cases permitted to them by law, or by especial leave of the apostolic see; or, who exact such taxes forbidden to be imposed or augmented.

§. 6. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all forgers of apostolic letters, even in form of a brief, and of supplications respecting indulgence or justice, signed by the pope of Rome,

pontificem vel S. R. E. vicecancellarios seu gerentes vices eorum, aut de mandato ejusdem pontificis signatarum, necnon falsò publicantes literas apostolicas, etiam in forma brevis, et etiam falsò signantes supplicationes hujusmodi sub nomine Romani pontificis seu vicecancellarii, aut gerentium vices prædicatorum.

§. 7. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes, illos, qui ad Saracenos, Turcas, et alios Christiani nominis hostes, et inimicos, vel hæreticos per nostras vel hujus sanctæ sedis sententias expressè vel nominatim declaratos deferunt seu transmittunt equos, arma, ferrum, filum ferri, stannum, chalybem, omniaque metallorum genera atque bellica instrumenta, lignamina, canabbem, funes, tam ex ipsâ canabbequàm aliâ quacunque materié, et ipsam materiam, aliæque hujusmodi, quibus Christianos et Catholicos impugnant; necnon illos qui per se vel per alios de rebus statum Christianæ reipublicæ concernentibus, in Christianorum perniciem et damnum ipsos Turcas et Christianæ relioginis inimicos, necnon hæreticos, in damnum Catholicæ religionis, certiores faciunt, illisque ad id auxilium, consilium, vel favorem quomodolibet præstant; non obstantibus quibuscunq; privilegiis qui-

or by the vice-chancellors of the holy see of Rome, or by their deputies, or by the command of the said pope; as also those who falsely publish the apostolic letters, even in form of a brief; and those who falsely sign such supplications in the name of the pope of Rome, or the vice-chancellor, or their deputies.

§. 7. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all those, who carry or transmit to the Saracens, Turks, and other enemies and foes of the Christian religion, or to those who are expressly and by name declared heretics by the sentence of us, or of this holy see, horses, arms, iron, wire of iron, tin, steel, and all kind of metals, and warlike instruments, timber, hemp, ropes made as well of hemp as of any other matter, and that matter whatsoever it be, and other things of this nature, which they make use of to the prejudice of Christians and Catholics; as also those who by themselves or others, give intelligence of matters relating to the state of Christendom to the Turks and enemies of the Christian religion to the hurt and prejudice of Christians, or to heretics to the prejudice of the Catholic religion, or who any ways afford to them counsel, assistance, or favour; notwithstanding any privileges hitherto granted

busvis personis, principibus rebuspublicis per nos et sedem prædictam hactenus concessis, de hujusmodi prohibitione expressam mentionem non facientibus.

§. 8. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes impediētes seu invadētes eos, qui victualia seu alia ad usum Romanæ curiæ necessaria adducunt, ac etiam eos qui ne ad Romanam curiam adducantur vel afferantur, prohibent, impediunt seu perturbant, seu hæc facientes defendunt per se vel per alios, cujuscunq; fuerint ordinis, præeminentię, conditionis et status, etiamsi ponticali seu regali aut alia quavis ecclesiastica vel mundanā prefulgeant dignitate.

§. 9. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes illos, qui ad sedem apostolicam venientes, et recedentes ab eadem, sua vel aliorum opera interficiunt, mutilant, spoliant, capiunt, detinent; necnon illos omnes qui jurisdictionem ordinariam vel delegatam á nobis vel nostris iudicibus non habētes, illam sibi temere vendicantes similia contra morantes in eadem curia audere perpetrare.

§. 10. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes interficientes, mutilantes, vulnerantes, detinen-

by us and the aforesaid see to any persons, princes or commonwealths; wherein express mention is not made of this prohibition.

§. 8. Farther we excommunicate and anathematize all hindering or invading those, who bring provisions, or any other things necessary, for the use of the court of Rome; as also those who forbid, hinder or obstruct the bringing or conducting of them to the court of Rome; or who abet the doers of these things either by themselves, or by others; of whatsoever order, preeminence, condition or quality they be, even although they be bishops or kings, or invested with any other ecclesiastical or secular dignity.

§. 9. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all those, who kill, maim, spoil, apprehend or detain by themselves, or by others, those who come to the apostolic see, or return from it; as also all those who having no ordinary jurisdiction, nor any delegated by us or our judges, rashly challenging it to themselves, presume to commit any like actions against those who reside at the court of Rome.

§. 10. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all who kill, maim, wound, detain, apprehend, or rob

tes, capientes seu deprædantes Romipetas seu peregrinos ad urbem causâ devotionis accidentes, et in eâ morantes, vel ab ipsâ recedentes, et in his dantes auxilium, consilium, vel favorem.

§. 11. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes interficientes, vulnerantes, mutilantes, percutientes, capientes, carcerantes, detinentes, vel hostiliter insequentes S. R. E. cardinales, ac patriarchas, archiepiscopos, episcopos, sedisq; apostolicæ legatos vel nuncios, aut eos à suis diocesis, territoriis, terris, seu Dominiis ejicientes, necnon ea mandantes vel rata habentes, seu præstantes in eis auxilium, consilium, vel favorem.

§. 12. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes illos, qui per se vel per alios, personas ecclesiasticas quascunque, vel seculares, ad Romanam curiam super eorum causis et negotiis recurrentes, ac illa in eâdem curiâ prosequentes, aut procurantes negotiorumque gestores, advocatos, procuratores et agentes seu etiam auditores vel iudices super dictis causis vel negotiis deputatos, occasione causarum vel negotiorum hujusmodi occidunt seu quoquo modo percutiunt, bonis spoliunt; seu qui per se vel per alios, directé vel indi-

travellers to Rome, or pilgrims for the sake of devotion, or pilgrimage going to that city, staying in it, or returning from it, and those who give aid, counsel, or favour in these cases.

§. 11. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all who slay, wound, maim, strike, apprehend, imprison, detain, or in hostile manner pursue the cardinals of the holy Church of Rome, and patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, legates, or nuncios of the apostolic see; or those who drive them out of their territories, diocesses, lands or dominions; or those who command or allow these things to be done, or give aid, counsel, and favour to them.

§. 12. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all those, who by themselves or by others slay, or any ways strike or despoil any ecclesiastical or secular persons having recourse to the court of Rome, for their causes and affairs, and prosecuting and managing them in the said court, or even the auditors or judges deputed for the hearing and managing of the said causes and affairs, upon occasion of these causes and affairs; as also those who by themselves or by others directly or indirectly presume to act or procure the said crimes, or

recté delicta hujusmodi committere, exequi vel procurare, aut in eisdem auxilium consilium vel favorem præstare non verentur cujuscunque præminentiae et dignitatis fuerint.

§. 13. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes tam ecclesiasticos quàm seculares, cujuscunque dignitatis, qui prætexentes frivolam quandam appellationem á gravamine vel futurâ executione literarum apostolicarum etiam in formâ brevis, tam gratiam quàm justitiam concernentium, necnon citationum, inhibitionum, sequestrationum, monitoriorum, processuum, executorialium, et aliorum decretorum, á nobis et sede prædictâ seu legatis, nunciis, præsidentibus, palatii nostri et cameræ apostolicæ auditoribus, commissariis, aliisque judicibus et delegatis apostolicis emanatorum, et quæ pro tempore emanaverint, aut aliàs ad curias seculares et laicam potestatem recurrent, et ab ea instante etiam fisci procuratore et avvocato, appellationes hujusmodi admitti, ac lites, citationes, inhibitiones, sequestra, monitoria, et alia prædicta, capi et retineri faciunt. Quive illa simpliciter, vel sine eorum beneplacito et consensu vel examine, executione, demandari, aut ne tabelliones et notarii

to give aid, counsel, or favour to them, of whatsoever pre-eminence or dignity they be.

§. 13. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all those as well ecclesiastics as seculares, of whatsoever dignity they be, who under pretence of a certain frivolous appeal from the injustice or future execution of the apostolic letters, even in form of a brief, respecting as well indulgence as justice, as also from the injustice and future execution of citations, inhibitions, sequestrations, monitories, processes, executorial, and other decrees, issuing out, or which shall at any time issue out from us and the aforesaid see, or our legates, nuncios or presidents, from the auditors of our palace and apostolic chamber, from our commissaries, and other apostolic judges and delegates; as also those, who any other ways have recourse to secular courts and the lay power; and who cause such appeals to be admitted by the secular court, even although the procurator and advocate of the Exchequer should require it; or who cause the aforesaid letters, citations, inhibitions, sequestrations, monitories, &c. to be seized

super hujusmodi literarum et processuum executione, instrumenta vel acta conficere, aut confecta parti, cujus interest, tradere debeant, impediunt vel prohibent ac etiam partes seu eorum agentes, consanguineos, affines, familiares, notarios, executores et sub-executores literarum, citationum, monitoriorum, et aliorum prædictorum capiunt, percutiunt, vulnerant, carcerant, detinent, ex civitatibus, locis et regnis ejiciunt, bonis spoliant, perterrefaciunt, concutiunt et comminantur per se vel per alium seu alios, publicé vel occulté; quive aliás quibuscunque personis in genere vel in specie, ne pro quibusvis eorum negotiis prosequendis seu gratiis vel literis impretrandis ad Romanam curiam accedant, aut recursam habeant, seu gratias ipsas vel literas à dicta sede impetrent seu impetratis utantur, directé vel indirecté prohibere, statuere seu mandare, vel eas apud se aut notarios seu tabelliones, vel aliás quomodolibet retinere præsumunt.

§. 14. Item, excommuni-

or retained; or those who hinder or forbid the said letters to be put in execution, either simply or without their good-will, consent, or examination; or who hinder or forbid scriveners or notaries from making or delivering when made to the parties concerned any instruments or acts concerning the execution of these letters and processes; or who apprehend, strike, wound, imprison, detain, drive out of cities, places, and kingdoms, despoil of their goods, terrify, vex, and threaten either by themselves or by others, publicly or privately, the parties or their agents, kindred on both sides, their friends, notaries, the executors or sub-executors of the said letters, citations, monitories, &c. or who any other way presume directly or indirectly to forbid, ordain, and command, any persons in general or in particular, to betake themselves, or have recourse to the see of Rome to prosecute their affairs of any kind, or to obtain indulgences or letters, or who forbid them to obtain the said indulgences, or to make use of them when obtained of the said see; or who presume to retain the said indulgences in their own hands, or in the hands of a notary or a scrivener, or any other way.

§. 14. Farther, we excom-

camus et anathematizamus omnes et singulos, qui per se vel alios auctoritate propriâ ac de facto, quarumcunq; exemptionem vel aliarum gratiarum et literarum apostolicarum prætextu, beneficiales, et decimarum, ac alias causas spirituales ac spiritualibus annexas, ab auditoribus et commissariis nostris, aliisq; iudicibus ecclesiasticis avocant; illarumve cursum et audientiam; ac personas, capitula, conventus, collegia, causas ipsas prosequi volentes impediunt, ac se de illarum cognitione tanquam iudices interponunt. Quive partes actrices, quæ illas committi fecerunt, et faciunt ad revocandum et revocari faciendum citationes vel inhibitiones aut alias literas in eis decretas, et ad faciendum vel consentiendum eos contra quos tales inhibitiones emanârunt, á censuris et pœnis in illis contentis absolvi, per statutum vel alias compellunt vel executionem literarum apostolicarum seu executorialium, processuum ac decretorum prædictorum quomodolibet impediunt, vel suum ad id favorem, consilium aut assensum præstant, etiam prætextu violentiæ prohibendæ, vel aliarum prætensionum, seu etiam, donec ipsi ad nos informandos, ut dicunt, supplicaverint aut supplicari fecerint, nisi

municate, anathematize all and singular who by themselves or by others, by their own authority and de facto, under pretence of any exemptions, or any other apostolic indulgences and letters, take away the cognizance of benefices and tithes, and other spiritual causes, or annexed to spirituals from our auditors and commissaries, and other ecclesiastical judges; and hinder the proceeding and audience of them, and the persons, chapters, convents, colleges, desiring to prosecute the said causes; or who intrude themselves as judges in the cognizance of them; or who by order, or any other way compel the plaintiffs to withdraw, or cause, to be withdrawn, their citations or inhibitions, or any other letters decreed in the spiritual court; and the defendants against whom such inhibitions were issued out, to procure, or consent to be absolved from the censures or punishments contained in them; or who any ways hinder the execution of apostolic letters, executorials, processes and decrees aforesaid; or give their allowance, counsel, or assent to it, even under pretence of hindering violence, or any other pretexts whatsoever, or even until they shall petition us, or cause us to be

supplicationes hujusmodi coram nobis et sede apostolicâ legitimè prosequantur, etiamsi talia committentes fuerint, præsidentes, cancellariorum, consiliorum, parliamentorum, cancellarii, vice-cancellarii, consilarii, ordinarii vel extraordinarii quorumcunq; principum secularium; etiamsi imperiali, regali, ducali, vel aliâ quacunq; præfulgeant dignitate; aut archiepiscopi, episcopi, abbates, commendatarii seu vicarii fuerint.

§. 15. Quive ex eorum pretenso officio, vel ad instantiam partis, aut aliorum quorumcunque personas ecclesiasticas, capitula, conventus, collegia ecclesiarum quarumcunque coram se ad suum tribunal, audientiam, cancellariam, concilium, vel parlamentum, præter juris canonici dispositionem, trahunt, vel trahi faciunt vel procurant, directè vel indirectè quovis quæsito colore; necnon qui statuta, ordinationes, constitutiones, pragmatikas, seu quævis alia decreta in genere vel in specie, ex quavis causâ et quovis quæsito colore, ac etiam prætextu cujusvis consuetudinis et privilegii, vel aliâs quomodolibet fecerint, ordinauerint et publicaverint, vel factis et ordinatis usi fuerint, unde libertas ecclesiastica,

petitioned for our better information, as is commonly pretended, unless they prosecute such petitions before us and the apostolic see in lawful form, even although those who commit such things should be presidents of chanceries, councils, or parliaments, chancellors, vice-chancellors, ordinary or extraordinary councillors of any secular princes (whether they be emperors, kings, dukes, or any other dignity,) or archbishops, bishops, abbots, commendataries or vicars.

§. 15. Also those who under pretence of their office, or at the instance of any party, or of any others, draw, or cause and procure to be drawn, directly or indirectly, upon any pretext whatsoever ecclesiastical persons, chapters, convents, colleges of any churches, before them to their tribunal, audience, chancery, council, or parliament, against the rules of the canon law; as also those who for any cause, or under any pretext, or by pretence of any custom or privilege, or any other way, shall make, enact, and publish any statutes, orders, constitutions, pragmatics, or any other decrees in general, or in particular, or shall use them when made and enacted; whereby the ecclesiastical liberty is violated, or any

tollitur seu in aliquo læditur vel deprimitur, aut alio quovis modo restringitur, seu nostris et dictæ sedis, ac quarumcunq; ecclesiarum juribus quomodolibet directè vel indirectè, tacitè vel expressè præjudicantur.

§. 16. Necnon qui archiepiscopos, episcopos, aliosq; superiores et inferiores prælatos, et omnes alios quoscunque judices ecclesiasticos ordinarios quomodolibet hæc de causâ directè vel indirectè, carcerando vel molestando eorum agentes, procuratores, familiares, necnon consanguineos et affines, aut aliàs impediunt, quo minùs jurisdictione suâ ecclesiasticâ contra quoscunque utantur, secundum quod canones et sacræ constitutiones ecclesiasticæ, et decreta conciliorum generalium, et præsertim Tridentini, statuunt; ac etiam eos qui post ipsorum ordinariorum ac etiam ab eis delegatorum quorumcunq; sententias et decreta, aut aliàs fori ecclesiastici judicium eludentes, ad cancellarias et alias curias seculares recurrunt, et ab illis prohibitiones et mandata etiam pœnalia, ordinariis aut delegatis prædictis decerni, et contra illos exequi procurant; eos quoque qui hæc decernunt et exequentur, seu dant auxilium, concilium, patrocinium et favorem in eisdem.

ways injured or depressed; or by any other means restrained; or whereby the rights of us and of the said see, and of any other churches, are any way directly or indirectly, tacitly or expressly prejudged.

§. 16. Also those who upon their account directly or indirectly hinder archbishops, bishops, and other superior and inferior prelates, and all other ordinary ecclesiastical judges whatsoever by any means, either by imprisoning or molesting their agents, proctors, domestics, kindred on both sides, or by any other way from exerting their ecclesiastical jurisdiction against any persons whatsoever, according as the canons and sacred ecclesiastical constitutions and decrees of general councils, and especially that of Trent, do appoint; as also those who after the sentence and decrees of ordinaries themselves, or of those delegated by them, or by any other means eluding the judgment of the ecclesiastical court, have recourse to chanceries or other secular courts, and procure thence prohibitions and even penal mandates to be decreed against the said ordinaries and delegates, and executed against them; also those who make and execute these decrees, or who give aid, council, countenance or favour to them.

§. 17. Quive jurisdictiones seu fructus, redditus et proventus ad nos et sedem apostolicam, et quascunque, ecclesiasticas personas, ratione ecclesiarum, monasteriorum, et aliorum beneficiorum ecclesiasticorum pertinentes usurpant, vel etiam quavis occasione vel causâ sine Romani pontificis vel aliorum ad id legitimam facultatem habentium expressâ licentiâ sequestrant.

§. 18. Quive collectas, decimas, talleas præstantias et alia onera clericis, prælatis et aliis personis ecclesiasticis, ac eorum et ecclesiarum, monasteriorum et aliorum beneficiorum ecclesiasticorum bonis, illorumve fructibus, redditibus, et proventibus hujusmodi, absque simili Romani pontificis speciali et expressâ licentiâ imponunt, et diversis etiam exquisitis modis exigunt, aut sic imposita à sponte dantibus et concedentibus recipiunt. Necnon qui per se vel alios directè vel indirectè prædicta facere, exequi vel procurare, aut in eisdem auxilium, consilium vel favorem præstare non verentur cujuscunque sint præeminentiæ, dignitatis, ordinis, conditionis aut statûs, etiamsi imperiali aut regali fulgeant dignitate; seu principes, duces, comites, barones, et alii potentatus; quicunq; etiam regnis, provinciis, civitatibus et terris

§. 17. Also those who usurp any jurisdictions, fruits, revenues, and emoluments belonging to us and the apostolic see, and any ecclesiastical persons upon account of any churches, monasteries, or other ecclesiastical benefices; or who upon any occasion or cause sequester the said revenues without the express leave of the bishop of Rome, or others having lawful power to do it.

§. 18. Also those who without the like special and express licence of the pope of Rome, impose tributes, tenths, tallies, subsidies, and other charges upon clergymen, prelates, and other ecclesiastical persons, and the goods, fruits, revenues and emoluments of them and of the churches, monasteries, and other ecclesiastical benefices; and exact them by divers artifices, or even receive them so imposed from the clergy, although they should of their own accord grant and give them. Also those who by themselves or others directly or indirectly, fear not to do, execute or procure the said things, or to give aid, council, or favour to them, of whatsoever preeminence, dignity, order, condition or quality they be, although they be emperors, or kings, or princes, dukes, earls, barons, and other potentates whatsoever, even

quoquo modo præsidentes, consiliarii et senatores aut quavis etiam pontificali dignitate insigniti. Innovantes decreta, super his per sacros canones, tam in Lateranensi novissimè celebrato, quàm aliis consiliis generalibus edita, etiam cum censuris et pœnis in eis contentis.

§. 19. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes et quoscunq; magistratus et iudices, notarios, scribas, executores, sub-executores, quomodolibet, se interponentes in causis capitalibus seu criminalibus contra personas ecclesiasticas illas processando, banniendo, seu sententias contra illas proferendo vel exequendo sine speciali, specificâ et expressâ hujus sanctæ sedis apostolicæ licentiâ; quique ejusmodi licentiam ad personas et casus, non expressos extendunt, vel aliàs illâ perperam abutuntur, etiamsi talia committentes fuerint consiliarii, senatores, præsidentes, cancellari, vice cancellarii, aut quovis alio nomine nuncupati.

§. 20. Item, excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnes illos, qui per se seu alios directe vel indirecte, sub quocunq; titulo seu colore invadere, destruere, occupare et detinere præsum-

presidents of kingdoms, provinces, cities and territories, counsellors and senators, or invested even with any pontifical dignity. Renewing the decrees set forth concerning these matters by the sacred canons, as well in the last council of Lateran, as in other general councils, together with the censures and punishments contained in them.

§. 19. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all and every magistrates and judges, notaries, scribes, executors, sub-executors, any ways intruding themselves in capital or criminal causes against ecclesiastical persons by processing, banishing, or apprehending them, or pronouncing or executing any sentences against them, without the special, particular and express licence of this holy apostolical see; also those who extend such licences to persons or cases not expressed or any other way unjustly abuse them; although the offenders should be counsellors, senators, presidents, chancellors, vice-chancellors, or intitled by any other name.

§. 20. Farther, we excommunicate and anathematize all those, who by themselves, or by others, directly or indirectly, under any title or colour whatsoever, shall presume to invade, destroy,

serint, in totum vel in partem, aliam Urbem, regnum Siciliae, insulas Sardiniae et Corsicae, terras circa Pharum, patrimonium B. Petri in Tuscia, ducatum Spoletanum, comitatum Venaysinum, Sabinensem, Marchiae Anconitanæ, Massæ, Trebariæ, Romandioliæ, Campanæ, et maritimas provincias, illarumque terras et loca, ac terras specialis commissionis Arnulforum, civitatesque nostras Bononiam, Cæsenam, Ariminum, Beneventum, Perusium, Avenionem, civitatem Castelli, Tudertum, Ferrarium, Comaclum, et alias civitates, terras, et loca, vel jura ad ipsam Romanam ecclesiam pertinentia dictaque, Romanæ ecclesiæ mediate vel immediate subjecta, necnon supremam jurisdictionem in illis, nobis et eidem Romanæ ecclesiæ competentem, de facto usurpare, perturbare, retinere et vexare variis modis præsumunt, necnon adhærentes, fautores, et defensores eorum, seu illis auxilium consilium, vel favorem quomodolibet præstantes.

§. 21. Volentes præsentibus nostros processus, ac omnia et quæcunque his literis contenta, quosque alii hujusmodi processus à nobis aut Romano pontifice pro tempore existente fiaut aut publicentur, durare, suosque effectus omnino fortiri.

seize, and detain, in whole, or in part, the city of Rome, the kingdom of Sicily, the islands of Sardinia and Corsica, the territories about Faro, St. Peter's patrimony in Tuscany, the dukedom of Spoleto, the county of Venoso, and Sabinum, Marca di Ancona, Massa, Trebaria, Romandiola, Campania, and the maritime provinces, and their territories and places, and the lands held in special commission by the Arnulsi, and our cities of Bononia, Cæsenà, Ariminum, Beneventum, Perusium, Avignon, Citta di Castello, Todi, Ferrara, Comaclo, and other cities, lands, and places and rights belonging to the Church of Rome, and subjected mediately or immediately to the said Church of Rome, also those who presume by divers means to usurp, disturb, detain, and vex the supreme jurisdiction to the said dominions belonging to us and the Church of Rome; also their adherents, favourers, and defenders, or those who any way give assistance, counsel, or favour to them.

§. 21. Willing that our present processes, and all and every thing contained in these letters, continue in force, and be put in execution; till other processes of this kind be made and published by us and the pope of Rome for the time being.

§. 22. Cæterum à prædictis sententiis nullus per alium quàm per Romanum pontificem, nisi in mortis articulo constitutus, nec etiam tunc, nisi de stando ecclesiæ mandatis et satisfaciendo cautione præstità, absolvi possit, etiam prætextu quarumvis facultatum et indultorum quibuscunque personis ecclesiasticis, secularibus et quorumvis ordinum, etiam mendicantium et militarium regularibus, etiam episcopali vel aliâ majori dignitate præditis, ipsisque ordinibus et eorum monasteriis, conventibus, et domibus ac capitulis, collegiis, confraternitatibus, congregationibus, hospitalibus, et locis piis, nec non laicis, etiamsi imperiali, regali, et aliâ, mundana excellentiâ fulgentibus per nos et dictam sedem ac cujusvis concilia decreti, verbo, literis, aut aliâ quacunque scripturâ in genere et in specie concessorum et innovatorum, ac concedendorum et innovandorum.

§. 23. Quòd si fortè aliqui contra tenorem præsentium talibus excommunicatione et anathemate laqueatis, vel illorum alicui absolutionis beneficium impendere de facto præsumserint, eos excommunicationis sententiâ innodamus, gravius contra

§. 22. In fine, none may be absolved from the aforesaid censures by any other than by the pope of Rome, unless he be at the point of death; nor even then, unless he giveth caution to stand to the commands of the church, and give satisfaction; in all other cases none shall be absolved, not even under pretence of any faculties or indulgences granted and renewed by us, and the said see, and the decrees of any council, by words, letters, or any other writing, in general or in particular, to any persons ecclesiastical, secular and regular of any orders, even of the mendicant and military orders, or to any persons invested with episcopal, or any greater dignity, and to orders themselves and their monasteries, convents, houses and chapters, to colleges, confraternities, congregations, hospitals, and pious places, as also to laymen, although they should be emperors, kings, or eminent in any other secular dignity.

§. 23. If by chance any should, against the tenor of these presents, de facto presume to bestow the benefit of absolution upon any such involved in excommunication, and anathema, or any of them, we include them in the sentence of excommuni-

eos spiritualiter et temporaliter, prout expedire noverimus processuri.

§. 24. Declarantes protestantes ac quaecunque absolutionem, etiamsi solenniter per nos faciendam, prædictos excommunicatos sub præsentibus comprehensos, nisi prius a præmissis cum vero proposito similia ulterius non committendi, destiterint ac quoad eos, qui contra ecclesiasticam libertatem, ut præmittitur, statuta fecerint, nisi prius statuta, ordinatione constitutiones pragmaticas, et decreta hujusmodi publicè revocaverint et ex archivis seu capitularibus, locis aut libris, in quibus annotata reperiuntur, deleriet cassari, ac nos de revocatione hujusmodi certiores fecerint, eos non comprehendere, nec eis aliter suffragari; quin etiam per hujusmodi absolutionem, aut quoscunque alios actus contrarios, tacitos vel expressos, ac etiam per patientiam et tolerantiam nostram vel successorum nostrorum, quantocunq; tempore continuatam, præmissis omnibus et singulis, ac quibuscunque juribus sedis apostolicæ ac sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ undecunque et quandocunque quæsitis, vel quærendis nullatenus præjudicari posse aut debere.

§. 25. Non obstantibus

cation, and shall afterwards proceed most severely against them, both by spiritual and temporal punishments, as we shall think most convenient.

§. 24. Declaring and protesting that no absolution, although solemnly made by us, shall comprehend, or any other way avail the aforesaid excommunicated persons comprehended under these present letters; unless they desist from the premises with a firm purpose of never committing the like thing; nor those, who, as was before said, have made statutes against the ecclesiastical liberty; unless they first publicly revoke those statutes, orders, constitutions, pragmatics and decrees, and cause them to be blotted and expunged out of the archives, rolls, and registers wherein they are preserved, and farther certify us of this revocation; moreover, that by any such absolution, or any other contrary acts, tacit or express, or even by the connivance and toleration of us and our successors for how long time soever continued, none nor any of the premises, nor any right of the apostolic see and holy church of Rome, howsoever and whensoever obtained, or to be obtained, can or ought to be prejudged or receive any prejudice.

§. 25. Notwithstanding

privilegiis, indulgentiis, indultis, et literis apostolicis, generalibus vel specialibus supradictis vel eorum, alicui, seu aliquibus aliis cujuscunque ordinis, status vel conditionis, dignitatis et præminentiaefuerint, etiamsi ut præmittitur, pontificali, imperiali, regali, seu quavis ecclesiasticâ et mundanâ prefulgeant dignitate, vel eorum regnis, provinciis, civitatibus seu locis à prædictâ sede ex quavis causa etiam per viam contractus aut remunerationis, et sub quavis alia forma et tenore, ac cum quibusvis clausulis, etiam derogatoriis derogatoriis concessis, etiam continentibus quod excommunicari, anathematizari vel interdicti non possint, per literas apostolicas non facientes plenam et expressam ac de verbo ad verbum de indulto hujusmodi, ac de ordinibus, locis, nominibus propriis, cognominibus et dignitatibus eorum mentionem nec non consuetudinibus, etiam immemorabilibus, ac præscriptionibus quantumcunque longissimis, et aliis quibuslibet observantiis scriptis vel non scriptis, per quæ contra hos nostros processus ac sententiâs, quo minus includantur in eis, se juvare valeant ac tueri. Quæ omnia quoad hoc, eorum omnium tenores, ac si ad verbum, nihil penitus omisso,

any privileges, indulgences, grants, and apostolical letters general or special granted by the holy see to any of the aforesaid persons, or any one of them, or any others, of whatsoever order, quality or condition, dignity, and preeminence they be; although, as was before said, they should be bishops, emperors, kings, eminent in any other ecclesiastic or secular dignity, or to their kingdoms, provinces, cities, and dominions, for any cause whatsoever, even by way of contract or reward, and under any other form and tenor, and with any clauses whatsoever, even derogatory of those which should derogate from them, or even containing that the said persons or places shall not be excommunicated, anathematized or interdicted by any apostolic letters, which do not make full and express mention and exact repetition of the said grant, and of the orders, places, proper names, surnames and dignities of the said persons: as also notwithstanding all customs, even immemorial, and prescriptions how long soever, and any other observances written or not written, by which the said persons may help and defend themselves against these our processes and censures from being included in them. All which

insererentur, præsentibus, pro expressis habentes, penitus tollimus, et omnino revocamus cæterisque contrariis quibuscunque.

§. 26. Ut vero præsentibus nostri processus ad publicam omnium notitiam facilius deducantur, chartas seu membranas processus ipsos continentes, valvis ecclesiæ S. Joannis Lateranensis, et Basilicæ principis apostolorum de urbe appendi faciemus, ut ii, quos processus hujusmodi concernunt, quod ad ipsos non pervenerint, aut quod ipsos ignoraverint nullam possint excusationem prætereundum aut ignorantiam allegare; cum non sit verisimile, id remanere incognitum, quod tam patentur omnibus publicatur.

§. 27. Insuper ut processus ipsi et præsentibus literæ, ac omnia et singula in eis contenta, eo fiant notiora, quo in plerisque; civitatibus et locis fuerint publicata, universus et singulis patriarchis, primatibus, archiepiscopis, et locorum ordinariis, et prælatis ubilibet constitutis per hæc scripta, committimus et in virtute sanctæ obedientiæ districtè præcipiendo man-

grants, as far as relates to this matter, and the whole tenor of them, accounting them expressed in these presents, as if they had been verbatim inserted nothing omitted, we utterly abolish and wholly revoke; and notwithstanding any other pleas which may be alleged to the contrary.

§. 26. But that these our present processes may more easily come to the knowledge of all persons, we have caused the papers and parchments containing the processes themselves to be affixed in the city to the doors of the church of St. John Lateran, and of the church of the Prince of the Apostles; that those whom these processes concern, may pretend no excuse, or allege ignorance, as if they had not come to their knowledge; since it is not probable that should remain unknown which is so openly published to all men.

§. 27. Moreover that the processes themselves, and these present letters, and all and everything contained in them, may become more manifest by being published in many cities and places; we by these writings intrust, and in virtue of holy obedience strictly charge and command all and singular patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops, ordinaries

damus; ut per se vel per alium seu alios, præsentés literas, postquam eas receperint, seu earum habuerint notitiam, semel in anno, aut si expedire viderint, etiam pluries, in ecclesiis suis, dum in eis major populi multitudo ad divina convenerit, sollemniter publicent, et ad Christi fidelium mentes, reducant, nuncient et declarent.

§. 28. Cæterum patriarchæ, archiepiscopi, episcopi, alique locorum ordinarii, et ecclesiarum prælati, necnon rectores, cæterique curam animarum exercentes, ac presbyteri seculares et quorumvis ordinum regulares, ad audiendas peccatorum confessiones quavis auctoritate deputati, transumptum præsentium literarum penes se habeant, easq; diligenter legere et percipere studeant.

§. 29. Volentes earundem præsentium transumptis etiam impressis notarii publici manu subscriptis, et sigillo judicis ordinarii Romanæ curiæ vel alterius personæ in dignitate ecclesiastica constitutæ munitis, eandem prorsus fidem in judicio, et extra illud ubiq; locorum adhibendam fore quæ ipsis præsentibus adhiberetur, si essent exhibitæ vel ostensæ.

of places, and prelates wheresoever constituted, that by themselves or some other or others, after they shall have received these present letters, or have knowledge of them, they solemnly publish them in their churches once a year or oftener, if they see convenient, when the greater part of the people shall be met for celebration of divine service; put faithful Christians in mind of them, relate them, and declare them.

§. 28. Lastly, all patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and other ordinaries of places, and prelates of churches, as also all rectors, and others having cure of souls, and priests secular and regular of whatsoever orders, deputed by any authority to hear confession of sins, shall have a transcript of these present letters by them, and shall diligently study to read and understand them.

§. 29. Our farther pleasure is, that the same credit in judgment and out of judgment, shall in all places be given to copies, although printed, of these presents, subscribed by any public notary, and sealed by the ordinary court of Rome, or any other person in ecclesiastical dignity; as would be given to these presents themselves, if they should be produced or shewn.

§. 30. Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam nostræ excommunicationis, anathematizationis, interdicti, innovationis, innovationis, declarationis, protestationis, sublationis, revocationis, commissionis, mandati et voluntatis infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contraire: Siquis autem hoc attentare præsumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei ac Beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum ejus se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum, anno incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo sexcentesimo decimo, sexto idûs Aprilis, Pontificatûs nostri anno quinto.

Anno à Nativitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi millesimo sexcentesimo decimo tertio, indict. 11. die verò quartâ mensis Aprilis, Pontificatûs sanctiss. in Christo Patris et D. N. D. Pauli divinâ Providentiâ Papæ V. anno octavo, supradictæ litteræ affixæ et publicatæ fuerunt ad valvas Basilicarum S. Joannis Lateranensis et Principis Apostolorum, et in acie campi Floræ per nos Baldasarem Vacham et Brandimartem Latinum Cursores.

JACOBUS BRAMBRILLA,
Mag. Curs.

§. 30. Let no man therefore, infringe, or boldly and rashly oppose this our letter of excommunication, anathematization, interdict, innovation, declaration, protestation, abolition, revocation, commission, command and pleasure: But if any one shall presume to attempt it, let him know that he shall incur the displeasure of Almighty God, and of his blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at Rome from St. Peter, in the year of our Lord's Incarnation one thousand six hundred and ten, the eighth of April, in the 5th year of our Popedom.

In the year, from the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, 1613, indict. 11. the fourth day of the month April, and the eighth year of the Popedom of our Most Holy Father in Christ, and our Lord Paul V. by Divine Providence Pope, the aforesaid Letters were affixed and published at the doors of the Churches of St. John Lateran, and the Prince of the Apostles, and in the field of Flora, by us Balthazar Vacha and Brandimars Latini Cursors.

JAMES BRAMBRILLA,
Mag. Curs.

NUMBER II.

The Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris upon the Pope's Bull, concerning the Franchisis in the City of Rome, and the following Ordinance of the 26th of December, 1687. Translated into English by order of his Excellency Monsieur Barillon, his Most Christian Majesty's Ambassador Extraordinary to the King of Great Britain.

AN EXTRACT OUT OF THE REGISTERS OF THE PARLIAMENT OF PARIS.

THIS day the Parliament of Paris being assembled, the King's Council appearing, Mr. Denys Talon, his Majesty's Advocate-General, made this following Speech: that among the rest of the court of Rome's attempts upon several occasions, in prejudice of the liberties of the church of France, and of the rights and preeminences of the Crown; there has been nothing observed in the history of late ages parallel to what was done in the month of December last, and which is nothing more but what the Pope has been contriving many years, in declaring himself an enemy of France, &c.

In the assembly held upon occasion of the affairs of the Regalia, the bishops being informed that the Italian doctors and the emissaries of the court of Rome omitted not any means to spread about the kingdom the new opinions of the pope's infallibility, and the indirect power which Rome strives to usurp over the temporality of kings; that assembly, we say, did not pretend to frame a decision of a doubtful controversy, but gave a public and authentic testimony of a certain truth, taught by all the fathers of the church, and determined by all the councils, and especially by those of Constance and Basil. And it is well known that the Cardinal of Lorraine, assisting at the Council of Trent, publicly declared that the Faculty of Divinity at Paris, the universities of the kingdom, and, in a word, all France, was persuaded, that the pope, far from being infallible, ought to submit to the decisions of councils, and it does not appear that this assertion made him incur any reproach from the court of Rome.

Yet has the world, with amazement, seen that the pope looked upon this declaration as an injury done to his authority; insomuch that the king having nominated to the episcopacy some of those that assisted at that assembly, and who are as well recommendable for their piety and virtue as for their knowledge and learning; bulls were refused them, on pretence that they do not make profession of a sound doctrine.

If this foundation is solid, we are like to have no more bishops for the future: since all the ecclesiastics of the kingdom, and particularly those that in the universities take the necessary degrees to attain to prelacies, with an invincible steadiness maintain the propositions which the pope complains of.

Though this refusal has not the least glimmering of reason, yet does it nevertheless raise a very great scandal, and produce disorders beyond expression. And indeed the pope's obstinacy is the cause that thirty-five cathedral churches remain destitute of pastors, and this in a time when a vast number of newly converted persons stand in need of instruction, for their being fortified and confirmed in the orthodox belief, and when the presence of the Bishops is very necessary in their dioceses.

Who could ever imagine that the pope, who is proposed to us as an image of holiness and virtue, should remain so wedded to his opinions, and so jealous of the shadow of an imaginary authority, that he should leave the third part of the churches of France vacant because we will not own him to be infallible?

Those that inspire these thoughts into the pope, can they fancy they shall make us change our opinions? And are they so blind as not to know that those unhappy times are past, when a gross ignorance joined to a faintness in the government, and false prepossessions, rendered the pope's decrees so very dreadful, however unjust they might be; and that those disputes and quarrels, far from augmenting their power, do only serve to cause inquiry to be made into the origin of their usurpations, and lessen the veneration of the people rather than increase it? &c.

And to give some colour to so scandalous an innovation, he refers to that famous bull styled in *Cænæ Domini*, because it is read at Rome every Thursday of the holy week. True it is, that if this decree, whereby the popes declare themselves sovereign monarchs of the world, be legitimate,

the majesty royal will then depend on their humour ; all our liberties will be abolished ; the secular judges will no longer have the power to try the possession of benefices, nor the civil and criminal causes of ecclesiastical persons ; and we shall quickly see ourselves brought under the yoke of the inquisition.

Thus, however unjust and abusive this new decree may be, it is much less dangerous by the frivolous menaces it contains, than by its being built upon a title altogether void and vicious ; and that, in this conjuncture, it looks as if Rome would at present follow the steps of Julius II.—renew his animosity and rage against France, without making reflection how odious his memory is in the Christian commonwealth.

When Pope Gregory IV. meaning to render himself arbitrator of the dispute that arose between Lewis the Debonnair and his children, threatened the bishops of France to excommunicate them if they did not close with his designs ; those prelates being surprised at a procedure so contrary to the canons, courageously answered, that *they would not obey the pope's will ; and that if he come with a design to excommunicate them, he should himself return excommunicated : Si excommunicaturus veniret, excommunicatus abiret.* As if they meant to say, that he who, without lawful cause, and through human motives, undertakes to suspend one of the members of Jesus Christ from the communion of the church, does separate himself from it by such an unjust attempt.

Let us farther urge, that the ill use which the popes have, on so many occasions, made of the authority with which they are entrusted, in giving it no other bounds than those of their own will, has been the source of almost all the incurable mischiefs with which the church is afflicted, and the most specious pretences of the heretics and schismatics that the last age produced, so as the divines assembled by Pope Paul III's order, did sincerely own ; and besides, at present, the bare idea of the infallibility and indirect power which the complaisance of the Italian doctors do attribute to the see of Rome, upon the temporality of princes, is one of the greatest obstacles that oppose the conversion, not only of individual persons, but of whole provinces ; and people's minds cannot be too thoroughly convinced that these new opinions do not make part of the doctrine of the universal church, &c.

If he had been an envoy from the Emperor of the Turks, from the King of Persia, or some other infidel prince, he would not have been so rigorously used. Is it that the pope means to have no more commerce with France? Is he persuaded that his power reaches no further than the diocese of Rome, and his patriarchship than the neighbouring provinces, styled suburbicarial? Does he intend to renounce the quality of Head of the Church and common Father of the Faithful? &c.

And in this occasion the thunders of the Vatican have nothing formidable; they are transitory fires, that exhale into smoke, and which do neither hurt nor prejudice, save to those who darted them.

And though this bull be neither published nor executed in the kingdom, it is not the less abusive. We do not doubt but that a more moderate pope, reflecting upon the disorders which such an innovation is capable of producing, would imitate the example of Clement V. who, by a solemn decree, did for ever abolish the memory of what his predecessor, Boniface VIII. had unjustly undertaken against King Philip the Fair; and this retractation, which proves that the popes are not infallible, since the one destroys what the other had built, among others, revokes the bull, *Unam Sanctam*, wherein Boniface, whose proud conduct was blamed by the whole church, declares that the sword of sovereigns is subjected to the pope's spiritual falchion, &c.

If, then we put in an appeal to the future council against the censures contained in the bull, and against the interdict that is consequence and accessory of it; it is because that not only the decisions of popes, but their very persons, when they fail in their duty in the government of the church, are to submit to the correction and reformation of the general council, in what regards as well faith as discipline: an indisputable truth whence we shall never depart, whatever endeavours the partizans of the court of Rome may use.

The pope's denying to grant bulls to all the bishops nominated by the king, occasions a disorder that daily augments, and which requires a speedy and efficacious remedy. The councils of Constance and Basil having endeavoured to contrive some moderation to the court of Rome's usurpations, and to the confusion that was introduced in the distribution of benefices, the pragmatic sanction was afterwards composed of the decrees of those councils: but the

popes perceiving their authority to diminish, made use of all sorts of artifices to abolish it; and by the concordate made between King Francis I. and Pope Leo X. they regulated the manner of disposing of bishopricks and abbeys. To the pope was granted not only the devolution, but also the prevention and the power of admitting the resignations in favour, and many other articles that are very burdensome to the ordinary collators and absolutely contrary to the ancient canons.

And indeed our forefathers did for a long while complain against the concordate. The ordinance of Orleans did re-establish the elections; and it would be very advantageous that all ecclesiastical matters were transacted in the kingdom, without ever being obliged to have recourse to Rome.

In the sequel nevertheless, the concordate was sincerely executed on our part; and it is inconceivable that the pope should now, through an invincible obstinacy, reduce us to deprive him of the profit which the court of Rome derives from a treaty, which is so much to its advantage.

The king is most religious in nominating to the prelacies ecclesiastics of an exemplary integrity, and of conspicuous merit; and because that these ecclesiastics do not believe that the pope is infallible; that they do not, like the Italian doctors, attribute to him the title of universal monarch; that they are persuaded he has no power, either direct or indirect, over the temporality of kings, and that he is to all intents inferior to the councils, that have a right to correct him, and to reform his decisions. The pope, upon this imaginary pretence, refuses them bulls, and leaves the third part of the churches of the kingdom destitute of pastors. Is this imitating the care and lenity of the apostles in the government of the church?

After all, before the concordate, those that were elected by the clergy and the people, and afterwards by the chapters, in presence of one of the king's commissioners; were they not ordained by the metropolitan, assisted by the bishops of the province, after that the king had approved of their election? The right acquired to the king by the concordate, being authorised in this respect by the tacit consent of the whole Gallican church, and confirmed by a possession of near two centuries, ought so much the less to receive any change and invasion, that during the first four ages of the monarchy, they went not to Rome to demand institution and induction of benefices. The bishops dis-

posed of all those that were vacant in their dioceses ; and our kings did almost ever nominate to the bishopricks ; and as they sometimes granted the clergy and the people the liberty of electing a pastor, they often reserved the choice of him to themselves ; he that they had chosen was immediately consecrated, without the pope's intermeddling in the matter. Who hinders us from following these examples, grounded upon this excellent reason, that the right, which all the faithful had in the beginning, of appointing themselves a head, being no longer to be exercised in common, ought to pass into the power of the sovereign, on whom the subjects rely for the government of the state ; of which the church is the noblest part ?

But as to the pope, since he refuses to join the concurrence of his authority to the king's nomination, we may presume that he means to discharge himself of the painful burden which overwhelms him ; and that his infirmities not permitting him to extend his pastoral diligence over all the parts of the universal church ; the devolution that is made in case of negligence, sometimes even from the superior to the inferior, may authorise the bishops to lay their hands on those that shall be nominated by the king to the prelacies ; his nomination having as much, or more effect, than the election of the people and the clergy ; which ought, without difficulty, to be confirmed by the immediate superior, when an unworthy person was not chosen.

And if the like resolution requires the being accompanied with some temperament ; if it requires the bishops' concurrence, the king may be besought to convene the provincial councils, or if need be, a national council, therein to take resolutions suitable to the occasions of the Gallican church.

And as the evil seems urgent, and that there would be possibly some danger in venturing upon the delays that are inseparable to the holding of a national council, his majesty may assemble such as he pleases of the principal officers, of the bishops, and considerable persons of all the orders of his realm, to take their advice in so important an affair.

But it is not just, that while the pope refuses to execute the concordate in one of its principal articles, he does nevertheless, enjoy the advantages that are granted him by that treaty, which contains conventions reciprocally obligatory ; that people continue to go to Rome, and thither carry

money, for the obtaining either the institution of benefices or dispensations, that may be easily expediated in the kingdom.

Now, if we purpose to bring off this traffic, it is only because it ceases to be reciprocal; and because that the pope, by his obstinacy, interposing an invincible impediment to the expedition of the bulls of a great number of bishopricks: it would be a shame to suffer that the Gallican church should remain burdened with the yoke of prevention of resignations in favour, and of all the other servitudes whereunto France was content to submit by the concordate.

And herein we do but faintly repel the injury that is done us: we oppose the buckler of our liberties against a new and unexampled enterprise, calamity and anathema, to those that out of interest or caprice, disturb the correspondence that ought to be between the priesthood and the royalty, who seem to have no other aim than to raise a schism in the church, and by fatal divisions disturb the peace which all Europe enjoys, and which was procured to it by the valour and wisdom of our invincible monarch.

But whatever endeavours those factious spirits may use that possess the pope and abuse the power which his great age and infirmities oblige him to give them in the government of the church, we shall ever remain inseparably united to the holy see we will acknowledge St. Peter's successor as the first and the chief of the bishops, we will most religiously maintain the communion and correspondence with the church of Rome, and we will defend ourselves with as much moderation as vigour against the insults, invasions, and innovations contrary to the king's rights, to the dignity of his crown, to the decrees of the councils, to the general policy of our church, and to our liberties.

All these reasons, and a world of others which we omit, oblige us to require that it would please the court to admit us as appealing against the abuse of the bull, dated in the month of May last, and of the ordinance given in pursuance thereof: and upon our appeal, to declare the said bull and ordinance void and abusive; making prohibition to all persons of vending them in the kingdom, on pain of being proceeded against according to the severity of the law; enjoining all those that have copies of them, to bring them to the register of the court, in order to their being suppressed: as likewise, to order that the act of appeal, made

by the attorney-general to the future council, be registered in the register of the court: that the king shall be most humbly besought to employ his authority for the maintaining of the franchises, and the immunity of the quarters of his ambassadors at Rome, in the whole extent that they have hitherto had: moreover, that his majesty may be humbly desired to order the holding of provincial councils, nay, and of a national council, if need be, or the assembly of the nobles of his realm; and after having heard their advice, to choose the means he shall reckon most fitting, for the hindering the disorders which the vacancy of so many archbishopricks and bishopricks in the kingdom do produce, and prevent the increase and progress of so dangerous an evil. We farther require that the king be also most humbly besought to forbid his subjects to have any commerce in the meanwhile with Rome, and of sending any money thither, and in this to interpose his authority as far as he shall judge convenient, and that it be ordered by the court that the arrest that shall intervene upon our present conclusions, shall be affixed in the public places, and every where as shall be needful in the wonted manner.

The king's council being withdrawn, a copy being perused, printed at Rome, of a bull concerning the franchises of the quarters of the said town, and of the following ordinance of 26th December last, together with the act of appeal put into the future council by the king's attorney-general the 28th of this month, and the conclusions by him taken in writing, the matter being brought under debate.

The attorney-general's appealing from the abuse of the said bull, and of the following ordinance on the 26th November last, the court admitted of the said appeal, and declares the said bull and ordinance as null and abusive; prohibits all persons whatsoever to vend them in the kingdom, on pain of being proceeded against according to the severity of the law; enjoining those that have copies of them to bring them to the register of the court, there to be suppressed; orders that the act of appeal put in by the king's attorney-general to the future council, shall be registered in the register of the court, and that the king shall be most humbly desired to employ his authority for the maintaining the franchises and immunities of the quarters of his ambassadors in the court of Rome, in the whole extent they have hitherto had; to order the holding of provincial councils, or even of a national council, or an assem-

bly of the nobles of his kingdom, so to advise about the most suitable means for the remedying the disorders which the long vacancy of several archbishopricks and bishopricks has therein introduced, and to prevent the progress and increase of them, and in the meanwhile to forbid his subjects in such manner as the said lord the king shall judge convenient, to have any commerce, or remit any money into the court of Rome. And this present arrest to be affixed in the public and usual places of this town, and every where as shall be needful. Done in parliament on the 23d of January, 1688.

(Signed)

JACQUES.

Act of the Appeal put in by the Attorney-General to the Council upon the subject of the Pope's Bull, concerning the Franchises in the city of Rome, and of the following Ordinance on the 26th of December last.

BEFORE the under-written apostolical notary was present in his own person, Messire Achilles de Harlay, counsellor of the king in his council of state, and his majesty's attorney-general, who in the presence, and by the advice and counsel of Messire Denis Talon, and of Messire Francois Criteau de la Moignon, also counsellors to the king in his council of state, and his advocates general in his court of parliament, has declared, that having some time since seen copies of a Bull given the 12th of May last past, by our holy Father, Pope Innocent XI. concerning the franchises which certain persons are in possession of enjoying in the city of Rome; he could not have imagined that his holiness could have conceived the design of comprehending the ambassadors which the king was willing to send to him, in the general menace of excommunication which he judged convenient to insert therein, contrary to the use observed by other popes in the Bulls made by them; and he hoped that if the remembrance of the sovereign power which the kings, his majesty's predecessors, exercised in Rome, of their liberalities to the holy see, and of the protection they gave to several popes, could not induce this pope to cause to be rendered to the king in the persons of his ministers, honours, and testimonies of acknowledgment proportionable to his bounties; at least his Holiness, as the visible head of the Church, would not be insensible to the prodigies which the king had performed before his eyes for the reuniting in

the bosom of his good mother, so vast a number of children that are gone astray from her ; that he would be affected with the piety of this prince, and the powerful protection he continually gives to prelates, though he was not with his victories and power ; and that he would not enter into dispute with him about rights that had not suffered any invasion, even for several years under his popedom.

But being informed that his Holiness had given order to the cardinal, that is his vicar in Rome, to declare the church of St. Lewis of the said city, and the ecclesiastics that officiate in it, interdicted for having admitted to the participation of the holy mysteries and sacraments on the night wherein is celebrated the solemnity of our Lord's nativity, Monsieur le Marquis de Lavardin, the king's ambassador extraordinary to his Holiness, and that it was supposed by the ordinance delivered upon this subject, that he was notoriously excommunicated for pretended contraventions to this bull ; the said attorney-general did not think that he could, without being wanting to his duty, remain any longer in the silence he had hitherto kept.

Now if the matter which has given an occasion to so great an excess, did concern the ecclesiastical jurisdiction which belongs to the Pope, he would easily show the errors that have been committed by proceeding against a person that has not been particularly specified in that Bull ; to whom the state of matters has not been signified since his being at Rome ; who might be ignorant of them in France, where it was not published ; that the Pope could not condemn him as an ambassador, though his character ought to secure him from those thunders, in regard of his functions, yet his Holiness would not so much as hear or own him in that quality, whatever addresses he has caused to be made for that purpose ; and that in fine, the very rules of the canon law, require that persons of so eminent a dignity, as is that of his, should be pointed out by name in Bulls of that nature, before they can incur the penalties they utter.

But that the Pope in a matter purely temporal, as are these franchises of the king's ambassadors, having made use of the spiritual arms, which he is only intrusted withal for the conduct and edification of the Church, and having constituted himself judge in his own cause, the excommunication which his Holiness's cardinal vicar declares to have been incurred is so null, that there is no occasion for any proceedings to annihilate it ; and those that are therein

comprehended, ought not to receive absolution, though it were even offered them at their own homes.

And, indeed, the said king's attorney-general does, with all the French, expect from his majesty's single power, the reparation which these proceedings challenge, and the conservation of those franchises which only depend on the judgment of God, as all the rights of this crown; and which can admit of no diminution but such as the king's moderation and justice may give them.

But as nothing can contribute more to lessen in the minds of shallow persons and libertines, the veneration which people ought to have for the power of the church, than the ill use which its ministers may make of it; the king's said attorney-general declares, that he is appealing, as indeed he appeals by the present act, from the abusive use that is made of it in the said Bull and ordinance, not to our holy Father Pope Innocent XI. better informed, so as has been practised in respect of some of his predecessors; when that they had true ideas of their power, and their years allowed them to act of themselves; there might be hopes that in time they would be brought to know the justice and truth of the complaints that were brought before them; and that neither the preventions in favour of their country, nor the partialities of those they honoured with their trust, did not prevail over the obligations which the quality of common father of all Christians does impose.

Protesting to carry on this his said appeal upon this grievance, and upon the others, which he reserves to represent to the first general council that shall be held, as the tribunal truly sovereign and infallible of the church, to which its visible head must submit, as well as its other members; and therein to further, among other things, a regulation that shall prevent the employing so holy an authority in uses so far from those for which it was confided in the church in the person of St. Peter; this may make the pope be mindful, that God having separated the two powers of the priesthood, and of empire, his holiness cannot make use of the authority of the first for the rights that depend on the second; that according to temporal laws, he ought to possess those large territories which his predecessors have received from the liberality of temporal princes, and particularly from that of our kings, and that, in short, he would consider upon a truth which a great archbishop in France wrote to one of his predecessors, that a prelate

that excommunicates a Christian contrary to the rules, and for rights of a kingdom of the earth, may, in such an occasion well lose the power of binding and unbinding which his character gives him; but that he cannot deprive of eternal life him to whom he does this injustice, if his sins do not render him unworthy of the mercy of God. Of which the said attorney-general has required of us an act. Done in the court, in the presence of the king's council, on the 22d day of January, in the year 1688.

MONSEIGNOR SIN. NOT.

Printed at Paris by Francis Muquets, the King and his Parliament's Chief Printer, Street le Harp, 1688. With his Majesty's Privilege.

NUMBER III.

Cleri Gallicani de Ecclesiastica Potestate Declaratio, A.D. 1682.

The Declaration of the Gallican Clergy, concerning the Ecclesiastical Power, in the Year 1682.

I. Beato Petro, ejusque successoribus Christi vicariis, ipsique ecclesiæ, rerum spiritualium et ad æternam Salutem pertinentium non autem civilium ac temporalium à Deo traditam Potestatem. Dicente Domino, regnum meum non est de hoc mundo. Et iterum, Reddite quæ sunt Cæsaris Cæsari, et quæ sunt Dei Deo. Ac proinde stare apostolicum illud: Omnis aniam potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit. Non est enim potestas nisi à Deo. Quæ autem sunt, à Deo ordinatæ sunt. Itaque qui potestati resistit. Dei ordinationi resistit. Reges ergo et principes in temporalibus

I. That God gave to St. Peter and his successors vicars of Christ, and to the Church herself, the power of spiritual things pertaining to eternal life, but not of civil and temporal matters. For the Lord said, My kingdom is not of this world. And again, Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's. And therefore that of the apostle must stand: Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God; who-soever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the or-

nulli ecclesiasticæ potestati Dei ordinatione subjici, neque autoritate clavium ecclesiæ directé vel indirecté deponi, aut illorum subditos eximi á fide, atque obedientiâ, ac præstito fidelitatis sacramento solvi posse: Eamque sententiam publicæ tranquillitati necessariam, nec minús ecclesiæ quàm Imperio utilem, ut Verbo Dei, patrum traditioni, et sanctorum Exemplis consonam omnino retinendam.

II. Sic autem inesse Apostolicæ Sedi, ac Petri successoribus Christi Vicariis rerum spiritualium plenam potestatem, ut simul valeant atque inmota consistant sanctæ œcumenicæ Synodi Constantiensis á Sede apostolicâ comprobata, ipsorumque Romanorum Pontificum, ac totius Ecclesiæ usu confirmata, atque ab Ecclesiâ Gallicanâ perpetuâ religione custodita decreta de autoritate Conciliorum generalium, quæ sess. 4 & 5 continentur: Nec probari á Gallicanâ ecclesiâ, qui eorum decretorum, quasi dubiæ sint autoritatis, ac minus approbata, robur infringant; aut ad solum schismatis tempus concilii dicta detorqueant.

dinance of God. Therefore kings and princes are not subject, in temporals, to any ecclesiastical power by the ordinance of God, neither can they, by authority of the keys of the church, directly or indirectly, be deposed, or their subjects absolved from their faith and obedience, and oath of allegiance which they have taken; and this is to be firmly retained, as necessary to the public peace, and not less useful to the church than to the state, as being consonant to the Word of God, the tradition of the fathers, and practice of the saints.

II. But that the full power of spiritual things is so in the apostolical see, and the successors of Peter, the vicars of Christ, that the decrees of the holy and œcumenical council of Constance, concerning the authority of general councils, which are contained in the fourth and fifth sessions, approved by the apostolical see, and confirmed by the use of the popes of Rome themselves, and the whole church, and kept with perpetual veneration by the Gallican church, should likewise remain of force and unshaken: Nor are they approved by the Gallican church, who would infringe the strength of these decrees, as if they were of doubtful authority or less

III. Hinc apostolicæ potestatis usum moderandum per canones, Spiritu Dei conditos et totius mundi reverentiâ consecratos; valere etiam regulas, mores, et instituta, à regno et ecclesiâ Gallicanâ recepta, Patrumque terminos manere inconcussos; atque id pertinere ad amplitudinem apostolicæ Sedis, ut statuta et consuetudines tantæ Sedis, et Ecclesiarum consentione firmatæ propriam stabilitatem obtineant.

IV. In fidei quoque questionibus præcipuas summi pontificis esse partes, ejusque decreta ad omnes et singulas ecclesias pertinere; nec tamen irreformabile esse judicium, nisi ecclesiæ consensus accesserit.

authentic, or who would wrest the words of the council only to the time of schism.

III. Hence the use of apostolical power is to be moderated by the canons, framed by the Spirit of God, and consecrated by the veneration of the whole world: And likewise the rules, customs, and institutions, which have been received by the kingdom and Gallican church are to be in force, and the bounds of our fathers to remain unshaken: And that this is for the eminence of the apostolical see, that the statutes and usage of so great a see, and established by the consent of the churches, should obtain their proper stability.

IV. The pope likewise has the chief part in questions concerning the faith, and his decrees have respect to all and singular churches. But nevertheless his judgment is not irreformable, except the consent of the church go along with it.

THE END.

WORKS

SOLD BY

RICHARD MOORE TIMS,

85, GRAFTON STREET.

The TRUE NOTION of the CHURCH. In Reply to the Bishop of Meax. 12mo. 6d.

SHERIDAN'S LECTURE on the Correct Reading of the LITURGY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND. 12mo. 3s.

The Use and Intent of PROPHECY, in the Second Ages of the World. By the Rev. Dr. THOMAS SHERLOCK, L.L.D. 12mo.

The ARTICLES of the CHURCH of ENGLAND, with Scripture Proofs. 6d.

WALKER'S LOGIC.

————— HORATIAN METRES. 9d.

————— EUCLID. 8vo.

————— ANNOTATIONS on LIVY. 12s.

WHEATLEY on the BOOK of COMMON PRAYER. 8vo. boards.

BURNETT on the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES of the CHURCH of ENGLAND. 8vo. 6s.

BUTLER'S ANALOGY. 3s. boards.

CARWITHEN'S HISTORY of the CHURCH of ENGLAND.

DAVISON on PROPHECY.

BLOOMFIELD'S GREEK TESTAMENT. £2.

————— GREEK and ENGLISH LEXICON. £1 8s.

BUXTORFF'S HEBREW LEXICON. 18s.

PARKHURST'S HEBREW LEXICON. 15s.

————— GREEK and ENGLISH LEXICON. £1.

BYTHNER'S LYRA PROPHETICA. £1 4s.

JONES'S CATHOLIC DOCTRINE of the TRINITY. 1s. 6d.

HINCKS'S HEBREW GRAMMAR. 7s.

BRINKLEY'S ASTRONOMY. Abridged, 5s.

M'CLINTOCK'S DIVINITY STUDENT'S ASSISTANT. 6s.

ELRINGTON'S EUCLID. 7s.

LARDNER'S EUCLID. 7s.

LUBY'S EUCLID. 12s.

SIMPSON'S EUCLID. 8s.

HOBART'S EPITOMY of BURNETT on the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES. 4s.

ANTHON'S HORACE. 7s. 6d.

———— SALLUST. 5s.

KENNEDY'S HOMER. 3 vols. 9s. per vol.

18mo. Cloth, 5th Edition, price 1s. 6d.

THE CONFESSIONS of HONOR DELANY.
By the Author of "Hyacinth O'Gara," &c.

18mo. Cloth, 2nd Edition, price 3s.

IRISH PRIESTS AND ENGLISH LANDLORDS.
By the Author of "Hyacinth O'Gara," "Confessions of Honor Delany," &c.

12mo. Cloth, 3rd Edition, price 5s.

IRISH MEN AND IRISH WOMEN. By the
Author of "Hyacinth O'Gara," "Confessions of Honor Delany," &c. &c.

Small 8vo. Cloth, 2nd Edition, price 4s. 6d.

MOTHERS and SONS. By the Author of "Hyacinth O'Gara," "Confessions of Honor Delany," &c. &c.

2 vols. 12mo. Cloth, price 14s.

HORÆ SOLITARIÆ; or, ESSAYS upon some remarkable Names and Titles of Jesus Christ, occurring in the Old Testament, and declarative of his Essential Divinity and Gracious Offices in the Redemption of Man. To which is annexed, an Essay, chiefly Historical, upon the doctrine of the Trinity. By AMBROSÉ SERLE, Esq.





UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



44 751 375

BX

1779

.L6

1154936

leslie

The Case stated

JUN 26 '37

Bindery

JUN 29 '37

1- 3499

1154936

①

1- 3499

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



44 751 375